This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

C 7225.13

Harvard College Library

FROM THE BEQUEST OF

JOHN HARVEY TREAT

OF LAWRENCE, MASS.

(Class of 1862)

THE CHURCH
IN THE
CONFEDERATE STATES

THE CHURCH
IN THE
CONFEDERATE STATES

A HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES

BY

JOSEPH BLOUNT CHESHIRE, D.D.

BISHOP OF NORTH CAROLINA

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET NEW YORK
LONDON, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA
1912

~~C 7627.9~~
C 7925.13
v



Treat fund

COPYRIGHT, 1911, BY
JOSEPH BLOUNT CHESHIRE

All Rights Reserved

THE · PLIMPTON · PRESS
[W·D·O]
NORWOOD · MASS · U·S·A

TO THE LIVING AND THE DEAD:
AND ESPECIALLY
TO
THE MEMORY OF
ALFRED AUGUSTINE WATSON, D.D.
LATE BISHOP OF EAST CAROLINA,
SOMETIME CHAPLAIN OF
THE SECOND N. C. REGIMENT, C.S.A.
AND OF
FRANCIS MARION PARKER,
LATE COLONEL OF
THE THIRTIETH N. C. REGIMENT, C.S.A.
AND TO
EDWIN AUGUSTUS OSBORNE,
ARCHDEACON OF CHARLOTTE,
SOMETIME COLONEL OF
THE FOURTH N. C. REGIMENT, C.S.A.
THIS VOLUME IS REVERENTLY AND
AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED

PREFACE

I VENTURE to call the following papers a History, because I believe that they give, with sufficient fullness for the ordinary reader, the story of the Church in the South, from 1861 to 1866, in all matters affecting its general interests as distinguished from local and diocesan details, with some account of its work and inner spirit, as they are related to the peculiar circumstances of the time and the situation.

The first three were written and delivered at the request of the Faculty of the Theological Seminary at Alexandria, as "*Reinicker Lectures*" for 1910. The others, with one exception, have been delivered at one or other of the Theological Schools at Middletown, Cambridge, Philadelphia, Sewanee, and the General Theological Seminary in New York. They are published substantially as they were delivered, with the addition of a few notes and tables of dates printed separate from the body of the text.

The writer believes that he should not have ventured upon this work but for the invitation of the Alexandria Faculty above referred to. But having become interested in the subject, and finding, from a somewhat extended correspondence with both clergymen and laymen, that so little was remembered or known of the history of the Church in the South during those

eventful and trying days, and also being encouraged by many evidences and expressions of interest in the subject, he went on until the most valuable parts of the material gathered grew into the form in which these papers are now given to the press. It has been more by providential leading, if so serious a term may be employed, that these papers have been written and published, than by any premeditated purpose on the part of the writer to obtrude himself upon publisher or readers. As, however, during the forty-six years which have passed since the close of the War between the States, no better hand has undertaken to trace the story here told; it is hoped that this attempt may prove of some interest and value to those who love the Church of our fathers and our forefathers.

It has seemed not inappropriate to add a brief study of the life and character of Bishop Atkinson, who bore so important a relation to the Church in the Confederate States.

Of the deficiencies and inadequacy of the work hardly any one can be so conscious as the writer, who yet ventures to submit it to the public.

J. B. C.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Secession of the States	3
	Its Effect upon the Dioceses	19
	The Meeting at Montgomery, July 3, 1861	35
II.	The Meeting at Columbia, October 16, 1861	39
	The Case of Bishop Polk	46
	The Consecration of Bishop Wilmer	49
	The "General Council" of November 12, 1862	54
III.	Church Work in the Army	69
	Some Confederate Chaplains	83
	Religious Reading for the Soldiers	91
	"The Church Intelligencer"	94
	The Confederate Prayer Book	98
IV.	The Church and the Negro	106
V.	The Spirit of the Church, and its Burdens	135
VI.	Some of the Trials and Tribulations of the Times	167
	Bishop Wilmer's Troubles in 1865	184
VII.	Peace, and the Reunion of the Dioceses	202
	Bishop Atkinson and the Church in the Confederacy	257
	Index	283

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES

THE
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES

I

THE SECESSION OF THE STATES; ITS EFFECT UPON THE DIOCESES; THE MEETING AT MONTGOMERY, JULY 3, 1861

Bishop Gregg, of Texas, makes a very suggestive observation in his Address to his Convention of 1862. He says: "It is one of the happy effects of revolutions, ecclesiastical and civil, if rightly conducted, to develop more fully principles that had long lain dormant, to evolve truth long obscured, and alike to expose, if not always to correct, the evils of error and corruption." The justice of this statement is, I think, illustrated by the history of our American Church in that momentous period lying between the years 1860 and 1866.

The admirable monograph upon the "Church in the Confederate States," by the late learned and judicious Dr. John Fulton, in the second volume of Bishop Perry's "History of the American Episcopal Church," so fully and adequately summarizes the constitutional history of that period, that it leaves little to be desired by one who wishes to have a clear and compendious statement of the principles involved, and of the way in which those principles were worked

out in the thought and action of our fathers and predecessors in the Church. It will, however, be found a not unprofitable study if we look a little more closely into the particular events of that momentous period, and examine more attentively and in more detail the currents and eddies of that great stream down whose perilous flood they were swept.

In considering the action of the several Dioceses of the South under the influence of the most profound and universal movement of public feeling ever aroused in the hearts of our people, it should be remembered that the Church in the South was numerically extremely weak. In Virginia and the Carolinas its historic position and its influence in the development of those States gave it a position of importance; and in all the Southern States the character, social antecedents, intelligence, and wealth of its members assured it of public consideration far out of proportion to its numerical strength. It may also be said that in Virginia and the Carolinas there were very considerable numbers identified with the Church, though not great in comparison with the total population. But in the Dioceses to the south of these there were in 1859 only one hundred and seventy-five clergymen in all, and less than ten thousand communicants. Not only was the Church weak in all those more Southern States, but as an organization it was new and but little known. In 1859 only one of those Dioceses was as much as thirty years old; and in every one of them the first Bishop the Diocese had known was

still its Diocesan. Georgia had some slight connection with early Church life and history, and cherished interesting traditions of the two Wesleys and George Whitefield, and of their work in Savannah; but south and west of the small remnant of the Georgia Colonial Church our organization was, as to local development, but of yesterday. Virginia and the Carolinas, and Maryland to a more limited extent, had been pouring emigrants into the South and Southwest, into Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Tennessee, and Arkansas, as during the same period New England and the Middle States had populated the upper Mississippi valley and the regions beyond. And where Virginia and Carolina Churchmen settled in the South and Southwest gradually little congregations and parishes were formed. In 1834 Bishop Otey was consecrated for Tennessee; in 1841 Bishop Polk resigned his immense missionary field to become Bishop of the new Diocese of Louisiana; and in the same year Bishop Elliott was consecrated the first Bishop of Georgia. Then came Bishop Cobbs for Alabama in 1844, Bishop Green for Mississippi in 1850, Bishop Rutledge for Florida in 1851, and Bishop Gregg for Texas, and Bishop Lay for Arkansas, in 1859. Thus the Church throughout the South had barely been organized and equipped with its proper diocesan appliances, when the whole country began to be disturbed by the unmistakable signs of a coming convulsion.

The General Convention of 1859, held in the City

of Richmond, was felt to be one of specially happy significance for the Church in the United States. The gracious hospitality of the people of that city warmed all hearts; Churchmen from adjoining States in unwonted numbers attended its sessions; important canonical legislation, pending for years, was brought to a successful conclusion; and the Consecration of five Bishops,[1] three of them for new Sees upon our missionary frontier, and all of them men giving sure promise of that eminent usefulness which marked their episcopal labors, crowned the work of the Convention with an unprecedented evidence of the growth and prosperity of the great national Church which it represented. And who shall say that the Christian love and sympathy, manifested and developed at the General Convention of 1859, was not part of the preparation to enable the Church to endure the sad trials so soon to come?

They were a notable body of men who at that time presided over the Southern Dioceses. Some of them were, at one time or another during their lives, involved in controversies and contentions of a most trying character. They were as a rule strong and assertive in their nature, and encountered, and perhaps sometimes they aroused, very determined opposition. But I believe no man then, and no man now, could fail to recognize their purity, elevation of character, and essential saintliness. One does not justly incur the censure of being "*laudator temporis acti*" by saying

[1] Bishops Gregg, Odenheimer, Bedell, Whipple, and Lay.

that Bishops Meade, Atkinson, Elliott, Cobbs, Otey, and Polk were men cast in a larger mould than the common. And the other Southern Bishops, Johns, Davis, Rutledge, Green, Gregg, and Lay, were worthy associates and fellows of those eminent men. With the exception of Bishop Johns they were all Southern men, of Southern birth and ancestry; from different regions of the South, though *all natives of Virginia and the Carolinas;* in their birth and training representing different phases of Southern life, the wealthy planter, the plain farmer of the piedmont section, the cultivated professional man of the Southern city; but all distinctly of the South in moral and intellectual fibre, in social habits and prejudices. For the most part their education had been in and of the South. Bishop Meade and Bishop Johns were, I believe, graduates of Princeton, and Bishop Rutledge of Yale. Bishop Atkinson was of Hampden-Sidney, Bishop Lay of the University of Virginia, Bishops Elliott and Gregg of South Carolina College, and Bishops Otey, Green, and Davis, of the University of North Carolina, in which Bishop Polk also had been a student before entering the Military Academy at West Point. Bishop Cobbs was without academic training in early youth, but had worked out his own intellectual development in the laborious calling of a country school-teacher in the up-country of Virginia.

Their attitude towards the questions then dividing public sentiment, slavery and the right of a State to secede from the Union, was fairly representative of

that of the South in general in its different phases. There were among them strong advocates of the right of secession. But there were also among them, as there were throughout the South, and especially in Virginia and in North Carolina, those who would have been glad to see some just and safe scheme of emancipation devised, and who were intensely opposed in sentiment to any suggestion of disunion. But, as a rule, these men believed that it belonged to the States alone, each acting for itself, to deal with the question of slavery; and that the armed coercion of a State, to retain it within the Union, was as plain a violation of the spirit of the constitutional compact as was the act of the State in withdrawing from the Union. Unquestionably such was the earnest conviction of the great body of those who in the South were called "Union Men" in 1860.

It is the happy memory and the justified boast of American Churchmen, both North and South, that the Church which we love had no share of responsibility for the sad and bloody years from 1861 to 1865. And we can further fairly claim that even in the fiercest hour of strife the Church upon both sides of the line did, on the whole, preserve the spirit of our common Master. While there was yet the hope and possibility of peace, the Church clung to that hope, and strove in prayer and in exhortation to develop that possibility into fact. After all prospect of South Carolina's remaining in the Union had disappeared, the Churchmen of Charleston, which was the very centre and

vortex of secession and anti-Union sentiment, continued faithfully to pray for the President and the Congress of the United States, until the Ordinance of Secession had actually been adopted. In the face of popular clamor against the use of the same prayers in Tennessee Bishop Otey published an open letter, not to his own people, as he was careful to say, but addressed to others, showing them why the Church in Tennessee must still pray for the constituted authorities.

It was in this time of uncertainty and of exasperated public passions, that the Southern Church, under the lead of its noble Bishops, took that stand upon the ground of its spiritual character and mission which was its safeguard through those years of peril.

From the beginning to the end the War came closer to the Southern people than it did to our Northern brethren. As a rule the people of the South had been more interested in purely political questions than the people of the North; and so large a proportion of the Southern leaders, both soldiers and civilians, being Churchmen, our Bishops and ecclesiastical leaders moved more within the heated atmosphere of public national life, and were strongly imbued with the political feelings animating their friends and associates. I believe this to have been the situation of our Bishops and Clergy in the South more than of those of the same classes in the North. There was no lack of sympathy even with the extremest school of politicians among many of the Clergy and some of the Bishops of the South. But both North and South the Church,

as a Church, had kept free of political entanglements. This was strikingly exemplified in the course of the leading Churchmen of the South during the trying days of 1860 and 1861.

In view of the disturbed and perilous state of the country the civil authorities in South Carolina appointed November 21, 1860, as a day of public fasting and prayer, and in Alabama November 29 was appointed for the same observance. In both States the Bishop set forth special devotions for those days, breathing a spirit of unaffected humility and love, praying that God would overrule all their purposes to the ends of truth, justice, righteousness, and peace.

The President of the United States appointed Friday, January 4, as a day of fasting and prayer, and the day was very widely observed as such throughout the South. In more than one Diocese the Bishop called the attention of his people to the President's appointment, and set forth special services or prayers for the day. In doing this Bishop Otey issued a Pastoral Letter to his Diocese, and charged his Clergy, by the solemn obligation of their ordination vow, to warn their people of the perils imminently threatening "the public safety and welfare by reason of the pride, licentiousness, violence, bloodshed, blasphemy, and irreligion which disturb the peace of society, defile the land, and provoke the wrath of Heaven. Passion and prejudice, arrogance and defiance — the most dangerous impulses to masses of men — rule the hour.

Appeals to the mild precepts and charitable spirit of the Gospel are considered mean and cowardly, and many, under the obligations of a Christian profession, speak and act as though their allegiance to their country absolved them from their duty of submission to the laws and exempted them from obedience to God. Let it be our business as ambassadors of the Prince of Peace to inculcate forbearance, to teach those for whose souls we watch that 'the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God'; to 'let their moderation be known to all men'; to 'study to be quiet, and to mind their own business'; and especially to be obedient to the laws and encourage others to be orderly, peaceable, submissive, and 'ready to every good word and work.'" In addition to public prayers Bishop Otey in the same Pastoral sets forth a long prayer for private use in families, morning and evening, to much the same purpose. Bishop Polk set forth a special prayer for the same day, as well as for general use, in the Diocese of Louisiana, and Bishop Gregg, of Texas, appointed a special service. Bishop Atkinson preached himself upon this fast-day in the largest church in his Diocese a noble sermon upon the national ruin which follows upon sin and unrighteousness, from the text: "Wheresoever the carcass is there will the eagles be gathered together."

In the midst of gathering clouds and distant mutterings of the coming storm the most widely circulated Church paper in the South [1] seized the occasion time

[1] *The Church Intelligencer*, published in Raleigh.

and again to speak most strongly of the evils of political preaching, to which some might be tempted by the general excitement, and urged the importance of applying public events to spiritual uses by arousing people to repentance and amendment of life, thus emphasizing amid the pressure of secular affairs the spiritual mission of the Church. Never did the Church more truly show the spirit of the Master than in this time of doubt and of fear.

South Carolina passed her Ordinance of Secession December 20, 1860. December 19 the Rev. C. P. Gadsden, of Charleston, wrote to a friend in Washington: "I prayed myself this morning (Wednesday) in the public service for both President and Congress, and shall do so until the State secedes." In each Southern State, as each, by the solemn and deliberate action of its people in convention assembled, withdrew from the Union, these prayers ceased. As a rule the change was made quietly and with a feeling, and sometimes with words, of sadness. In making the announcement to his people good Bishop Rutledge, of Florida, says: "We cannot contemplate (as Christians) this dismemberment of the Union without deepest regret." Even in South Carolina there seems to have been a gentle aversion on the part of saintly Bishop Davis to contemplate the unavoidable results to the Church of this act of the State. The Bishop of Texas, himself but newly transplanted from South Carolina, gives a most striking illustration of the reluctance with which Churchmen faced the new aspect

of ecclesiastical affairs. In his admirable Pastoral Letter of December 27, 1860, he speaks beautifully of the duty of Christians in those times of strife and discord: "I charge you then as you will have to answer to the Judge of quick and dead, to remember the part you are taking, and the spirit with which you act, at this grave juncture of our history. . . . That holy religion, whose blessing is above all price, calls you to moderation and charity. The benign spirit of Christianity invokes you to illustrate its principles." Even after Texas had seceded, in a Pastoral Letter dated March 5, 1861, and in his Convention Address the following month, he preserves a tone of very great moderation. In giving directions for the change in the prayers for the civil authorities he says: "In the meantime the Church at large will go on as heretofore under God, presenting therein a salutary spectacle and ever-timely lesson to the world, in the discharge of her divine mission, with her unity undisturbed and the communion of saints unbroken, preaching peace on earth, good will towards men, and leaving the course of God's providential rule, and the best interests of our holy religion, to determine her action in the future."

It was the Bishop of Louisiana who sounded the first clear note for the separate and independent organization of the Church in the South. It is not at all certain that in *sentiment* he differed from his most conservative Southern brethren. His sincerity no one ever doubted, and his expressions of regret at

the rending asunder of the relations with the brethren in the North are most deep and tender. But he was eminently a man of action, of firm and decided character, who upon taking any position, or entering upon any course of action, accepted at once what he recognized as its natural and necessary consequences. The other Southern Bishops, as a rule, accepted in the first instance the fact of secession and the actual interruption of accustomed relations without looking further, perhaps without rigidly examining themselves as to what in their own minds the next step must be. Doubtless some had no clear views as to future consequences; as good Bishop Gregg had said: "Leaving the course of God's providential rule . . . to determine her [the Church's] action in the future"; or as Bishop Rutledge: "But it is in the hand of Providence." Equally submissive to God's Providence Bishop Polk saw certain consequences absolutely unavoidable, in his understanding of ecclesiastical history and polity. Many wiser men differed with him, but it is quite probable that he was entirely unconscious what weighty reasons could be urged upon the other side. To his mind there was no possibility of any other course, and he spoke out in a voice that startled the Church, and aroused instant response of concurrence or of opposition. Upon the secession of the State of Louisiana he issued a Pastoral and declared his position, January 30, 1861: "The State of Louisiana having by a formal ordinance, through her Delegates in Convention assembled, withdrawn

herself from all further connection with the United States of America, and constituted herself a separate sovereignty, has by that act removed our Diocese from within the pale of the 'Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.' We have therefore an independent Diocesan existence. . . . In withdrawing ourselves therefore from all political connection with the Union to which our brethren belong, we do so with hearts filled with sorrow at the prospect of its forcing a termination of our ecclesiastical connection with them also. . . . Our separation from our brethren of The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States has been effected because we must follow our nationality. Not because there has been any difference of opinion as to Christian Doctrine or Catholic usage. Upon these points we are still one. With us it is a separation, not division, certainly not alienation. And there is no reason why, if we should find the union of our Dioceses under one National Church impracticable, we should cease to feel for each other the respect and regard with which purity of manners, high principle, and manly devotion to truth, never fail to inspire generous minds."

This bold and bald statement, that political action of the State determines *ipso facto* the *status* of the Church in its most intimate relations with its component parts, and the resulting dissolution of all constitutional and canonical connections and obligations, produced a painful impression in both sections of the country. Three months later, April 25, Bishop Polk

put forth another Pastoral, attempting,[1] not very felicitously, to explain his first; and a large and able committee of his Convention made an elaborate report endeavoring to maintain the position he had taken; and that position was hotly debated by learned correspondents on both sides of the question in the Church papers. None of the other leaders in the South ever took exactly Bishop Polk's position. They endeavored to reach the same conclusion by different arguments. But Bishop Polk had seen two things clearly and had stated them briefly and forcibly. He had seen that, as a matter of fact, separation between North and South, ecclesiastical as well as political, had come; and that the practical effect of secession was that the Church North and South, in the then state of public feeling *outside the Church*, could not go on under one administration. If every Churchman in the South and in the North had desired it, it could not have been done. Whether his theory was correct or not, he saw the facts of the situation as they were, and he stated the facts. He was more conversant with facts than with theories. Again, he saw also that this separation was forced upon the Church from without, and had not come from within; and he gave felicitous expression to that fact in a phrase which came to be the common expression to describe the situation —

[1] He goes so far, in this second Pastoral, as to suggest that, though present circumstances demand present union of the Southern Dioceses in a separate organization, yet the future may allow a union of North and South in matters of a general nature, "in which greater efficiency would result from a union of our resources and energies."

"*Separated, not Divided.*" A family united in heart may be broken up by sad providences and scattered far asunder; but the love of parent and child, of brothers and sisters, thus sundered, still glows in their hearts; the family is a separated family, not a divided family.

For some time yet no other of the great leaders spoke authoritatively on this subject. And from distant Texas comes the voice of its earnest Missionary Bishop to say how far he was at that time from taking Bishop Polk's position. He says, April 11: "If again the general sentiment of the Church North and South should ultimately be found to tend to the expediency of the severance of the ecclesiastical union heretofore existing, the friendly consultation on our part,[1] as preparatory to the final action of the General Convention, would be in every way desirable." And this suggestion of a separation into two Provinces, as it were, by *the action of the General Convention*, was not without its advocates in other parts of the South.

But it had by this time become plain to all that, to prevent confusion and the unwisdom of divided counsels, steps should be taken for a conference of the Dioceses in the seceded States. Bishop Polk and Bishop Elliott, the seniors among the Bishops of these Dioceses, met at Sewanee, the seat of that great enterprise, the University of the South, in the early spring,

[1] This refers to the call issued by Bishops Polk and Elliott, March 23, 1861, for a meeting of the Southern Bishops and Dioceses in Montgomery, July 3, 1861, as will presently appear.

and sent out over their joint names the following letter to their Episcopal brethren and to the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Alabama, whose Bishop had died January 11, 1861:

University Place,
Franklin County, Tenn.
March 23rd, 1861.

Rt. Rev. and Dear Brother:

"The rapid march of events and the change which has taken place in our civil relations, seem to us, your brethren in the Church, to require an early consultation among the Dioceses of the Confederate States, for the purpose of considering their relations to the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, of which they have so long been the equal and happy members. This necessity does not arise out of any dissension which has occurred within the Church itself, nor out of any dissatisfaction with either the doctrine or discipline of the Church. We rejoice to record the fact, that we are to-day, as Churchmen, as truly brethren as we have ever been; and that no deed has been done, nor word uttered, which leaves a single wound rankling in our hearts. We are still one in Faith, in purpose and in Hope; but political changes, forced upon us by a stern necessity, have occurred, which have placed our Dioceses in a position requiring consultation as to our future ecclesiastical relations. It is better that these relations should be arranged by the common consent of all the Dioceses within the Confederate States than by the independent action of each Diocese.

The one will probably lead to harmonious action, the other might produce inconvenient diversity. We propose to you therefore, dear brethren, that you recommend to your Diocesan Convention, the appointment of three clerical and three lay deputies, who shall be delegates to meet an equal number from each of the Dioceses within the Confederate States, at Montgomery, in the Diocese of Alabama, on the third day of July next, to consult upon such matters as may have arisen out of the changes in our civil affairs.

"We have taken it upon ourselves to address you this Circular because we happen to be together, and are the senior Bishops of the Dioceses within the Confederate States.

"Very truly yours in Christian bonds,

"Leonidas Polk, *Bishop of Louisiana.*

"Stephen Elliott, *Bishop of Georgia.*

"P.S. We have named as late a day as the 3rd of July because the Diocesan Convention of South Carolina does not meet this year until the 16th day of June."

This is the document which called the Bishops and representatives of the Southern Church together, and made the beginning of the "Church in the Confederate States of America."

There was at this time an amazing diversity of opinion, among the Bishops and Churchmen of the South, as to the effect of the secession of a State upon

the ecclesiastical *status* of the Diocese within that State. Bishop Polk had boldly asserted the principle that *the Church must follow nationality*, and that by the mere force of the secession of the State of Louisiana the Diocese of Louisiana was torn away from all ecclesiastical relations, and was isolated, with respect to all other Dioceses in the world. No other Bishop or Diocese, except perhaps the Bishop and Diocese of Texas after 1861, ever took so radical a position. Alabama, when her Convention met, May 2, 1861, declared in effect that the diocesan constitution had been adopted upon the ground that the State of Alabama was one of the United States, and would so continue; and that, the State having withdrawn from the Union, the constitution, so far as it had assumed the existence of that bond between the States, was now of no force. The Convention therefore declared the first article of the diocesan constitution, and all canonical legislation depending on that article, null and void. This was not quite the same as saying that *the Church must follow nationality*, but only that the particular conditions of its organization required each Diocese to be within the United States.

The Bishop of Georgia argued out this same position very ably, alleging that it was the mind of the Church, in its Constitution of 1789, that the Bishop shall go with his jurisdiction: "He is a Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, not because he is a Bishop of the Church Catholic, but because he is the Bishop of Maine, or of New York, or of New Jersey, as the case

may be. When the jurisdiction, therefore, of a Bishop declares itself, in the exercise of its rightful sovereignty, to be thenceforth and for ever separated from the other jurisdictions which make up the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, it forces him necessarily into a like separation. . . . The separation of his jurisdiction severs him at once from the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, not simply because the Church must follow the nationality, but because the Church of the United States has trammelled itself with constitutional and canonical provisions, which force the Church and its Bishop into this attitude." In the Convention of Georgia there was a very general expression of an earnest desire to preserve the unity of the Church, if possible, and it was suggested that the Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States should be so amended as to render the Church "wholly superior to territorial destructions [qu: distinctions?] in the prosecution of her work."

In the Diocese of Florida it was very earnestly debated in the Convention, Whether the Diocese had the right, after the secession of the State, to send deputies to the General Convention. And it was decided almost unanimously that, under the Constitution of the Church in the United States, there was no such right.

But it was the Bishop of South Carolina who gave the most ingenious turn to this constitutional argument, and maintained that position with most subtle

skill. He went back to the principle of the old English statutes of *Præmunire*, which denied the right of any foreign power to exercise jurisdiction within the realm of England, thereby destroying the Pope's claim to jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical. Bishop Davis's argument is most interesting and acute. He distinctly repudiates Bishop Polk's theory and thus sets forth his own: He says it had been "thought by some that the secession of the State necessarily carried with it the secession of the Church, but this can hardly be allowed, unless there be some compact to that end, entered into by the Church herself. She is intrinsically a spiritual polity. She was so constituted by her divine Lord, and for many years maintained that position alone. But she is capable of union with other ecclesiastical bodies, and with the State itself. Necessarily, however, it must be only with her own consent, and she must preserve her independent spirituality as a Church. The effect, therefore, of the action of the State upon the Church, or of confederated dioceses upon a single diocese, must be by compact or constitutional law. In England there was a union between the Church and State. One of the laws of that United Kingdom was, that no subject of a foreign government should exercise spiritual jurisdiction in Great Britain. Thus, when the United States were acknowledged as an independent government, the clergy who were the subjects of that government became necessarily separated from the English Church, and excluded from spiritual jurisdiction therein or subjection thereunto.

The same principle lying, I think, deep in the bosoms of those who originated the constitution of the General Convention, was wrought into that document, and the principle is there set forth, and is, I think, more thoroughly incorporated in it even than expressed, that none but a citizen of the United States shall be a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. We are, of course, so no longer, nor entitled to spiritual jurisdiction therein, nor subject to the government thereof. . . . There is no principle of spiritual life involved, there is no article of faith at issue. It is simply a question of constitutional confederation, and our conclusion is that the condition of confederation being broken, the confederation exists no longer. . . . It has been broken also by action without ourselves as a Church. The course of divine providence, in the entire change of the government of which we are subjects, has determined this for us."

Renewing the same question in his Convention Address of 1862, Bishop Davis says: "Jurisdiction in the Church is not strictly *jure divino.* The right of jurisdiction is, but the appointments and arrangements are not. Therefore, although *in the Church* its construction and relations must be human only. They must occupy the same ground as other human institutions, and be subject to the dispensations of Divine Providence and the necessary changes of things. The truth is the present great revolution is a dispensation extraordinary, and a revelation from God. It is a

voice from on high, speaking to men, and changing and shaping the forms of society both civil and religious."

He refers to his proposition set forth the year before: "I see no reason to change that judgment. The more it is examined into, the more I think it will appear, that the words 'in the United States' in Article I, and 'in any of the United States' in Article V, are terms of jurisdiction, and not merely descriptive of locality. . . .

"So far I have not considered the case of original diocesan independency — subject, however, to the just and due relations to Catholic Christianity, and the associated duties thence resulting. This I acknowledge: and that it is the proper form into which the Church resolves herself upon every necessary dissolution of confederacy."

The whole discussion is most interesting, and it is the ablest argument and the strongest presentation of the position of those who held that the secession of the State necessarily involved the separation of the Diocese from the Church in the United States. Bishop Davis was by birth and education a North Carolinian, and most of his ministry before his elevation to the Episcopate had been in that Diocese. He had now for some years been a citizen of South Carolina, the home of the great metaphysical statesman, Calhoun, and his reasoning seems to show the influence of his later surroundings. He had been bred to the Bar, and was an elder brother of the eminent lawyer, Mr.

George Davis, Attorney-General of the Confederate States.

Bishop Lay, consecrated in 1859 "Missionary Bishop for the South West," found himself in a somewhat different situation from that of the other Southern Bishops. He had no diocese, and was merely ministering, under the authority of the House of Bishops of the Church in the United States, within a territory assigned by them. No diocese had been organized within the State of Arkansas, the place of his residence and the region of his chief activity. But the State of Arkansas had seceded. His strong sense of the divine character and authority of the Church made him slow to recognize any effect upon its organization and constitutional position to be effected by the mere political action of the secular power. As a reasonable man dealing with actual conditions he recognized the necessity of a separate organization for the Church in the Confederate States, since there was an actual separation making united action impossible; but he looked for a separation to be authorized by the Church as a whole, acting through the General Convention, such as Bishop Gregg had at first suggested. When the course of events made this no longer possible, he found his position most perplexing. "Diocesan Bishops," he argued, "possess a character, and are invested with a jurisdiction, which remain unaltered by any rearrangement of Provincial boundaries." On the other hand, "The Missionary Bishop is a delegate sent forth by the general body, dependent for jurisdiction on its

will." This general body, the Church in the United States, claimed jurisdiction over the citizens and territory of the United States. As he no longer recognized Arkansas to be a part of the territory of the United States, and as that was his residence and included most of the congregations under his care, though his jurisdiction embraced also territory still within the limits of the United States, he felt that he should resign his commission as Missionary Bishop of the Church in the United States. July 26, 1861, he addressed a letter to the Presiding Bishop of the Church in the United States, resigning his jurisdiction as Missionary Bishop of that Church. On the same day he addressed a letter to the Bishops of the Church in the Confederate States, notifying them of his action, and saying that, though without canonical authority, he would continue his Episcopal ministrations in Arkansas until the Church in the Confederate States should take action upon the matter.

Although learned Bishops and astute committees did not commit themselves to Bishop Polk's *dictum* that the Church must follow nationality — and even the Committee of his own Convention, though they employed the phrase and endeavored to give a certain support to it by reference to early national churches, did really base their argument upon the particular facts of our American history — yet, without question, the prevailing motive in most cases sprang out of the strong national sentiment aroused by the approaching struggle. In the popular mind "the Church must fol-

low nationality." This was the feeling which showed itself in editorials and correspondence in *The Church Intelligencer*, the most widely circulated Church paper in the South. The words of the Preface to the American Prayer Book seemed to support this view; and it can hardly be doubted that this sentiment, sanctioned apparently by the very words of the Church, prevailed more with the average Churchman than the most ingenius constitutional argument. It was pointed out, on the other hand, that the relation between the Church and the civil government in England justified the statement in 1789 that, "When in the course of Divine Providence, these American States became independent with respect to civil government, their ecclesiastical independence was necessarily included," as we read in the Preface to the Prayer Book. But it is much easier to accept the statement as it stands than to search out its limitations and qualifications.

These different views were of less importance at the time from the fact that they all met in one common conclusion as to present duty. Whether because of the necessity that "the Church should follow nationality," by reason of some essential principle in the Constitution of the Universal Church; or because of principles inherited from the English Church and embedded in the Constitution of the General Convention; or because of the express provisions of Articles I, V, and X of that Constitution; or because of the free and voluntary action of the Bishop and Diocesan Convention, recognizing the actual separation caused by war, and

acting *ex necessitate rei* in providing for doing the work of the Church; — all agreed in the necessity of separate organization.

The Bishop of North Carolina attended the opening service of the Convention of the Diocese of Virginia of 1861, and joined Bishop Meade and Bishop Johns in a note addressed to the Bishops of the seceded States, requesting the postponement of the meeting called for in Bishop Elliott's and Bishop Polk's circular, and suggesting as a more convenient place of meeting Raleigh, Asheville, or Sewanee. Virginia had just seceded; it was evident that the action of the Government at Washington would drive North Carolina to take the same course; and this postponement was asked in order that these Dioceses, which desired to act in concert, might be represented at the meeting.

The meeting was not postponed, and consequently Virginia and North Carolina were not represented. But it may be well in this place, in connection with what has been said about the position of other Dioceses and Bishops, to give Bishop Atkinson's views as developed in his Address to his Convention, July 10, 1861, upon the important question of the effect of the secession of the State upon the ecclesiastical *status* of the Diocese. With the exception of Bishop Gregg, all the Bishops and Dioceses, who had spoken or taken action, had in effect declared that, upon one ground or another, the secession of the State had the effect of separating the Diocese from the Church in the United States, though they had varied somewhat in the

reasonings by which they had reached this conclusion. Bishop Atkinson alone contended that the political action of the State had, of itself, no effect whatever upon the Church; but that the Diocese was free to remain connected with the Church in the United States, or to form an independent organization, as the necessity might seem to require with reference to its own spiritual interests and work. He says to his Convention of 1861: "I do not entertain the view which many hold, that the severance of the National Union does of itself, and without any act of the Church, produce a disruption of the bonds which bind our Dioceses together. This is a matter in itself of so much importance, and is likely to furnish so controlling, and, as it seems to me, so dangerous a precedent for the future, that it ought to be very carefully considered, before we adopt the conclusion just now referred to, recommended though it be by persons for whom we have the sincerest respect. The question is not, you observe, what may these Southern Dioceses rightfully and wisely do, but what is the effect on them, willing or unwilling, of what others have done.

"It is clearly wise, and even necessary, that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States shall be greatly modified. . . . But that is not the matter before us now. We have first to decide, not whether we shall modify or destroy that Church, but whether there is such a Church now in existence. If the Dioceses established in the States which have seceded are no longer a part of the Protestant Episcopal

Church in the United States, — are indeed no longer a part of any ecclesiastical organization, but are separate and independent each of the other, and each of the rest of Christendom, — How has this very important change been brought about? Not by their own act, for those which have acted in recognition of their Diocesan isolation only profess to recognize an existing fact. They do not separate from the other Dioceses; they declare themselves to have been already separated by the acts of the States within whose limits they have been organized. What were those acts? The secession of those States from the Political Union of which they had previously formed a part. . . . Take, for example, the case of any one of our Dioceses. It is formed within a State, the population of which is generally alien to our Church, not hostile perhaps, but indifferent; not recognizing its authority, of course not concerned to advance its growth or to preserve its principles. Within this mass of population, most of whom are attached to some form of Protestant dissent — some of whom are Roman Catholics, a few of whom are Jews, and some rejectors of all revealed religion — we have a few congregations, amounting in the most favored Dioceses to not a tenth of the whole number of the people, in others to not a hundredth. Does the action of such a body politic determine, *ipso facto*, without the Church being consulted, without its action, without any expression of its will, perhaps against its will, what shall be its relation to its sister Dioceses, and through them to the Churches in alliance

with our own, — to its Missions, Foreign and Domestic, — to the General Seminary, and to its entire Code of Canon Law, other than that which is merely Diocesan? . . . According to the theory that secession in the State produces a disruption of the Church, each Diocese in the seceding States is relegated to a condition of absolute isolation and independence. . . . Each stands alone in Christendom; conditions I believe to be without precedent in Church History, from the Apostles' time downward, except perhaps when the ban of excommunication has rested on a Diocese. Its results must be to deprive our Delegates of their rights to seats in the General Convention, in the Board of Missions and in the Board of Trustees of the General Seminary." He calls attention to the fact that the State could not by any direct attempt thus deprive the Church of its rights, annul its privileges, and confiscate its property, as well as abrogate its most solemn laws and regulations: "Yet shall we say that what could not be done directly has been done indirectly? . . . Of course I know that the State is not thinking of us, does not wish to tyrannize over us, or to exercise any power over us; but the question is, does it really exercise this prodigious power by virtue of principles and facts embodied in the subject itself? I think it does not," etc.

He calls attention to the possible results of such a view in the future: "Suppose the Dioceses in the Confederate States form a united Church, as no doubt they will, and that one of these States should after-

wards secede from the Confederacy, then the Diocese in that State will be cut off, whether she wish it or no, from the Southern Church; then the Church throughout all time will have her relations settled for her by men not necessarily of her communion, perhaps by men hostile to her, and anxious to destroy her. Was it ever heard before that the Church of Christ was under such bondage?"

He calls attention to the fact that it is not at all clear that a Diocese in a foreign country may not be in union with the Church in the United States, even when there has been no previous connection between that country and our own: "The Right Reverend Drs. Boone and Payne are Bishops of that Church, exercising Episcopal functions, and possessing jurisdiction, under its authority, and liable to its discipline. If Dioceses were established at Shanghai and Cape Palmas, I see no hindrance either in our constitution or in Church principles, to those Dioceses being received into union with the Church in the United States."

To this position the Bishop of North Carolina adhered with a calm courage and confidence characteristic of the man, though it caused some moments of pain and misunderstanding in the period between the secession of the State and the adoption by the Diocese of North Carolina of the Constitution of the Church in the Confederate States, in May, 1862.

He recurs to the subject in his Convention Address May 15, 1862, and the importance of the question will

justify a further quotation. He says in that Address: "It is certain that the Diocese of North Carolina was, in the autumn of 1860, a part of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and it is equally certain that that Church has done no act since to exscind it, nor has the Diocese by its own act withdrawn itself. If then it be not now a part of the same Church, it must have been cut off by virtue of the political change produced by the secession of the State. But could the State, by any political act, destroy the organization of the Church, and annul its Constitution and Canons, which were its bonds of union with the Church in the United States? If it be the Church of Jesus Christ, or a part of the Church of Jesus Christ (and which of its members will declare it not to be?), then the State can neither make nor unmake it, alter or amend it, directly or indirectly; for Jesus Christ said: 'My Kingdom is not of this world.' His Church, so far from being the creature of the State, or in the power of the State, like clay in the hands of the potter, to receive any shape the State may choose to give, — *His Church*, instead of being thus ductile and malleable, was planted in spite of the State, and grew up and flourished under the most vehement and obstinate assaults and opposition of the State. He, then, that proclaims that the Protestant Episcopal Church is changed in its organization and laws by the mere act of the State, does, however little he may intend it, yet in effect declare that it may be a very respectable religious denomination, wealthy, refined and orderly,

but that it is no part of the Church of Christ; and does in effect advise all its members, if they desire to partake of the blessings of the Church of Christ, to come out of the Protestant Episcopal Society, and go elsewhere for those blessings. I do not see then, how any considerate man, who does believe in the authority and mission of the Church, can suppose that its organization has been broken up by the mere act of the State. . . . We do not lose our rights and interest, then, in that Church by ceasing to be citizens of the United States, but only when we voluntarily withdraw from that Ecclesiastical organization, and establish another for ourselves. This, I conceive, we had the right to do, even if the United States had not been divided, were there sufficient cause for it; and that division does itself furnish sufficient cause. In the mean time, according to my belief, until we form a new organization, the old continues to subsist. There is no interregnum of anarchy. We are not left weltering in chaos, without a Constitution, without any binding regulations for the consecration of Bishops, for the ordination of Clergymen, for the enforcement of discipline, so that each man is free to do what is right in his own eyes. God forbid we should ever be in such a condition."

Unfortunately we have no record of the utterance of the great Bishop of Tennessee upon this interesting question. The journal of the Diocese of Tennessee for 1861 is said to have been destroyed by a fire in the printing office, and was never published; and no other

Convention was held until that of 1865. It does appear, however, that he took the same view which is so convincingly set forth in the above passages from Bishop Atkinson's addresses of 1861 and 1862. Bishop Atkinson makes this statement in the *Church Intelligencer* of February 21, 1862; and it is further evidenced by the fact that Bishop Otey, like Bishop Atkinson, gave his consent to the Consecration of Bishop Stevens, of Pennsylvania, and declined to concur in the Consecration of Bishop Wilmer, of Alabama.

The meeting in Montgomery, July 3, 1861, was attended by Bishops Elliott, Green, Rutledge, and Davis and by fourteen clergymen and eleven laymen, representing the Dioceses of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Texas only, of the Dioceses invited, was unrepresented. The proceedings were brief, sensible, and marked by perfect harmony and good feeling. It was in the nature of a conference, all orders sitting together and discussing freely the few topics introduced. Bishop Elliott, as the senior by Consecration of the Bishops present, was called to the chair, and the Rev. John M. Mitchell, of Alabama, was appointed secretary. A committee, with the Bishop of Mississippi as chairman, was appointed to propose business for the meeting. This committee brought in a majority report signed by the Episcopal and lay members of the committee, and a minority report by the clerical members was presented by the Rev. F. A. P. Barnard, afterwards the dis-

tinguished President of Columbia College. As is apt to be the case, the clergymen were rather more aggressive than the Bishop and the laymen. The difference, however, was not very great. The majority report deferred all important action looking to permanent organization to a Convention of the Church in all the seceded States, to be held in the summer of 1862; only recommending present action to provide for the missionary work, domestic and foreign. The minority urged the preparation by that meeting of a Constitution for the Church in the Confederate States, following closely that of the Church in the United States, to be sent down to the several Dioceses for ratification and adoption. This difference was wisely compromised by referring the question of the Constitution to an adjourned meeting to be held in Columbia, South Carolina, October 16, 1861; and a committee was appointed to prepare a draft of a Constitution and Canons, to be presented to that meeting.

Resolutions were adopted appointing Mr. Jacob K. Sass and Mr. Henry Trescott, both of Charleston, to be treasurers respectively for Domestic and Foreign Missions, and requesting them to remit directly to domestic and foreign missionaries already in the field such moneys as should be contributed to that end. It was also resolved that the Southern Dioceses pledge themselves to sustain Bishop Lay and Bishop Gregg in the important work committed to them.

Recognizing the very great difference of opinion in regard to the theoretical *status* of the Dioceses in the

Confederate States in relation to the Church throughout the United States, the Convention very wisely:

"*Resolved*, That the secession of the States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas and Tennessee from the United States, and the formation by them of a new government, called the Confederate States of America, renders it necessary and expedient that the Dioceses within those States should form among themselves an independent organization."

The meeting then adjourned to the sixteenth day of October following. The chairman in his closing address could say with truth what can seldom be said of any meeting: "We have done, brethren of the Convention, enough at this meeting, and yet not too much." For men who met together in the opening days of a revolution, in such a stress of feeling, and amid such discordant influences, they had shown a calmness, a moderation, a wisdom, a true Christian charity and peaceableness, seldom equalled.

SECESSION OF THE SOUTHERN STATES

DATE OF THE ORDINANCE OF SECESSION IN THE SEVERAL STATES

South Carolina	December	20,	1860
Mississippi	January	9,	1861
Alabama	"	11,	"
Florida	"	11,	"
Georgia	"	19,	"
Louisiana	"	26,	"
Texas	February	1,	"

Virginia	April	17,	1861
Arkansas	May	6,	"
Tennessee [1]	"	6,	"
North Carolina	"	20,	"

[1] The Ordinance of Secession of the State of Tennessee was passed May 6, and was ratified by a popular vote June 9 following.

II

THE MEETING AT COLUMBIA, OCTOBER 16, 1861; THE CASE OF BISHOP POLK; THE CONSECRATION OF BISHOP WILMER; THE "GENERAL COUNCIL" OF NOVEMBER 12, 1862.

THE Convention which met in Trinity Church, Columbia, S. C., October 16–20, 1861, was an adjourned meeting of that which had assembled in Montgomery July 3. By this time the situation had so developed that every Diocese in the South felt free to participate in its proceedings. Bishop Lay, Missionary Bishop of the Southwest, having his residence and chief work in Arkansas, was also present. Of the Bishops, only Bishop Polk was absent. Texas had no clerical or lay representatives in attendance, and Tennessee and Louisiana were represented only in the clerical order; but with these exceptions each Diocese was present by its Bishop and its deputies of both orders. As at Montgomery, all sat together in one deliberative body under the presidency of the senior Bishop, now the venerable Bishop Meade, of Virginia.

The chief business was the consideration of the report of the committee appointed at Montgomery to prepare the draft of a Constitution and a body of Canons for the Church in the Confederate States. However, only the proposed Constitution could be

taken up, the Canons being referred to future consideration and action.

As reported by the committee, the Constitution was, for the most part, but a rearrangement, in somewhat better and more convenient form, of the Constitution of the Church in the United States. Its one marked departure was the introduction of the principle of the Provincial System, so related to the general and diocesan organization that, with the growth of the Church and the multiplication of Dioceses, the development into Provinces would have been automatic and unavoidable. So long as an entire State remained within the limits of one Diocese, that Diocese constituted one Province, and no change was made. But as soon as more than one Diocese should be formed within a State, at once the Provincial machinery came into operation. The several diocesan councils within the State Province would send their representatives to the Provincial Council. This Provincial Council in turn would elect deputies from its several included Dioceses to the triennial General Council; and it would be only through the medium of the Provincial Council that the several Dioceses would have their relations with the General Council and with the Church in other Dioceses and Provinces. In the House of Deputies of the General Council each Province would have but one vote in each order; and in the House of Bishops all the Bishops of one Province, whatever their number, would have but one vote, which would be cast by the senior Bishop of the Prov-

ince. Each Province would send five clerical and five lay deputies to the General Council. Pending the operation of the proposed Provincial System, each Diocese should be represented in the General Council by three deputies of each order.

This was too radical a departure from the familiar system to command general support, but the Provincial System was so far adopted as to allow two or more Dioceses, formed within a single State, to unite and constitute a Province, should they desire to do so; as has since been allowed by the Constitution of the Church in the United States. If State Provinces are to be desired, then the scheme set forth in the proposed Constitution for the Church in the Confederate States is much better than what we now have, for it would have effected its purpose, which our present Article VII has never done.

In the discussion of the first Article of the proposed Constitution the Rev. Richard Hines, of Tennessee, moved to amend by substituting the words "Reformed Catholic" in place of "Protestant Episcopal," in the name of the Church; and Bishops Otey, Green, and Atkinson, and the Rev. Mr. Hewett, of Florida, voted with Dr. Hines for the change.[1] It was defeated by a

[1] As this seems to have been the first formal movement to give this name to our Branch of the Church in America, it may be well to notice the reasons assigned in the very meagre account in *The Church Intelligencer* of what must have been a most interesting discussion; "Bishop Atkinson . . . considered the question between 'Protestant' and 'Reformed' — the latter expressed a fact, the former a spirit. The term Protestant denoted unrest, doubt, unbelief, and was indefinite.

large majority, as was also a proposal to omit the word "Protestant" in the same connection.

The Constitution as adopted reduced the number of Presbyters and of self-supporting parishes required for the formation of a new Diocese. It also put the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies upon an equality in matters of legislation, by removing the provision of our old Article III, by which action by the House of Deputies might become effective without the concurrence of the House of Bishops, and even in opposition to their action, unless they should act and notify the Deputies within three days.

Thus, with very inconsiderable alterations, the Constitution remained as it had been before. There appeared to be no eager desire for change or for emphasizing the fact of separation. Nothing was attempted in the way of legislation at this time. It was felt that, until the Constitution had been ratified and adopted by the Dioceses, there could be no proper basis for canonical action; and so the whole body of Canons, prepared and reported along with the Constitution to the Convention of October, 1861, was ordered to be printed, and was referred to the first General Council to be held under the Constitution when adopted. One of the changes of the new Constitution

He knew what the Reformation was, — he did not know what Protestantism was. . . . He liked the word Catholic, because it indicated the continuity of the Church of Christ." *Church Intelligencer*, Nov. 1, 1861. It was claimed by some at the time that but for the opposition from Virginia the change of name would have been adopted. This, however, seems very improbable.

was to substitute "Council" for "Convention" in the name of the legislative assemblies, both of the Dioceses and of the national triennial meetings, with the rather unfortunate result of giving to the latter the name, quite inappropriate, of "*General Council.*" The name Council is still retained in some of the Southern Dioceses as the designation of the annual Convention.

The report of the committee, appointed at Montgomery in July to draw up a scheme for carrying on the general missionary work, was also referred to the future Council, and Mr. Sass and Mr. Trescott were requested to continue to act as treasurers of Domestic and Foreign Missions respectively. They were authorized to distribute such funds as might be sent to them for general work among the missionaries in the field. Contributions for Domestic Missions were ordered to be "distributed among the Bishops, for their respective fields, according to the rates of appropriation made by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States for the present year."

It was, on motion of the Rev. Richard H. Wilmer, afterwards Bishop of Alabama,

"*Resolved*, That the Convention, in view of the present circumstances of the Country, recognize with peculiar solemnity the duty of the Church towards the people of the African race within our borders, and earnestly urge upon the ministry and laymen of the Church increased effort for the spiritual improvement of this people."

The Diocese of Alabama, being without a Bishop,

had applied to this Convention for advice as to the possibility of procuring the Consecration of a Bishop before the ratification and adoption of the proposed Constitution and Canons of the Church in the Confederate States. The petition was referred to a committee consisting of the three senior Bishops present, Bishop Meade, Bishop Otey, and Bishop Elliott. The report made by this committee is said to have been written by Bishop Meade, and is rather vague and indecisive in dealing with the very important questions involved. Its unsatisfactory character is believed to have been the reason why it was passed over by the Convention without any action. But as illustrating the spirit of the Convention, and its temper and feeling in approaching this matter, its purpose in connection with what has sometimes been spoken of as a "*Schismatical Consecration*," a few lines of the report may be quoted: "All the Confederate States, by the goodness of God, possess the privilege of Episcopal supervision except Alabama. The ordinary course of canonical proceedings for the election and Consecration of a Bishop has been stopped by the interruption of all intercourse between the Northern and Southern States in the late Federal Union. This interruption, however, of social and ecclesiastical intercourse between brethren of the same communion, however much to be regretted, has been occasioned by circumstances over which the Church in its ecclesiastical organization has had no control, and it is still highly desirable and earnestly wished that the 'unity of the spirit' be preserved by

us all 'in the bond of peace,' and that that same spirit of love and peace, which our Lord so earnestly inculcated in his first followers, be cultivated and cherished among us." The report goes on to suggest that the Diocese of Alabama should proceed in the usual manner to elect a successor to Bishop Cobbs, and that the result of such choice should then be certified in the usual course to the Standing Committees and the Bishops of the Dioceses within the Confederate States, upon whose favorable response it seemed to be presumed that the Presiding Bishop would take order for the Consecration of the person so chosen and approved. So far as appears in the printed Journal, no action whatever was taken on this report, nor was the subject-matter of it further referred to. We shall see, however, that it was not without effect.

The Convention before adjourning, upon a motion by the Rev. Dr. Wilmer,

"*Resolved*, That this Convention recommend to the several Dioceses within the Confederate States, until more permanent action can be taken, the provisional adoption of the body of Canons known as the 'Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America,' so far as they are not in conflict with the political relations of the Confederate States, and do not interfere with the necessities of our condition."

After a session of nine days this second general meeting of the Church in the Confederate States adjourned, having done its work diligently, faithfully,

and well. So far as can be judged by the record, and so far as tradition has testified of their words and of their spirit, it is hard to find a blemish in the work of those patient and godly men.

It was not until about the beginning of the year 1862 that the War became very real to us in the South, or its pressure very apparent. One mark, however, it made in this first period upon the Church. One of the foremost Bishops of the South, and of the whole country, was absent from his place in the councils of the Church, and was in high command in the Confederate Army. The Bishop of Louisiana came of a race of soldiers, and, after leaving the University of North Carolina, had been educated at the Military Academy at West Point. Under the pressure of the times, and upon the threatened invasion of his country, he had felt it to be his duty to respond to the call made upon him, that he should contribute his personal service in organizing for defence against invasion, by accepting an important position, which at the time there seemed no one else at hand capable of filling. This was his own statement of the case; and as soon as the emergency had passed, he made earnest efforts to resign the charge and to lay down his commission. The authorities, however, declined to accept his resignation, and much pressure was brought to bear upon him to dissuade him from his purpose of retiring; and, as time went on, his Diocese, coming more and more into the occupancy of the enemy, left but little opportunity

for the exercise of ordinary episcopal duty. He therefore continued in the hard, laborious, and self-sacrificing service of the field and the camp until the tragic end at Pine Mountain, June 14, 1864.

By all testimonies General Polk's influence in the army, and especially among the general officers, was such as nobly attested his character and the reality of the qualities best becoming his position in the Church. He did not execute any holy function except in a few cases of emergency, but his humble and devout attendance upon services and sacraments, and his unaffected holiness of life, exerted a powerful and manifest influence in the army where he served. The highest officers of the Army of Tennessee were, with few exceptions, brought under this influence. Many of them who had not been professedly Christians were baptized and confirmed. A striking instance, among others, may be given from Bishop Quintard's personal narrative of his own eventful career. Speaking of an urgent message he had received to proceed to some distant point to baptize General Hood, he says: "It was impossible for me to go, but it was a great pleasure for me to learn that General Polk arrived with his staff that night, and baptized his brother General. It was on the eve of an expected battle. It was a touching sight, we may be sure, — the one-legged veteran, leaning upon his crutches to receive the waters of Baptism and the sign of the Cross. A few nights later General Polk baptized General Johnston and Lieutenant-General Hardee, General Hood being

witness. These were two of the four ecclesiastical acts performed by Bishop Polk after receiving his commission in the army."

I shall not attempt any discussion of Bishop Polk's case. So far as his character and the purity and disinterestedness of his motives are concerned, he needs no defence. In general it is admitted that the obligation of the Ordination Vow seems to shut a clergyman off *from any secular calling*, from that of a soldier as from every other. Personally, however, I have no hesitation in saying that I regard the hard, unselfish, perilous, self-sacrificing life of a soldier in the camp and in the field, in time of war, as far less inconsistent with lofty spiritual attainments, and with the adequate illustration of the very highest qualities of the Christian and priestly character, than indulgence in selfish ease, and personal comfort, and all the relaxations of an easy fortune, which few of us fail to practise when we have opportunity. Let it be admitted that the common mind and conscience of the Church have realized in experience that to bear arms is inconsistent with the priestly character. Be it so! But let the Christian mind and conscience go on and realize that many other things, which it has not come to reprobate, are still more deadly to the spiritual life and power of the clergy. It would ill become us, who so readily grasp at every opportunity of personal advantage, and are so easily persuaded to relax the rigidity of self-denying service, and so early retire from all hard labors, when the circumstances of our worldly

condition allow it — it would ill become us to condemn any heroic soul, who left a great estate, and dignified ease, and domestic endearments, that he might labor, and suffer, and agonize, and die at the call of duty as he heard it. God grant that we, feeble successors of those great men, may, in some humble way and in some small measure, share in their reward at the last day![1]

Though the Convention of October, 1861, had given no reply to the petition of the Diocese of Alabama, the suggestions of the report on the subject were followed, and November 21 the Rev. Richard Hooker Wilmer, D.D., was elected Bishop by the Convention of that Diocese. This election was certified to the several Standing Committees of the Dioceses within the Confederate States, and in due course to the Bishops. Much about the same time notifications were sent out from Pennsylvania of the election by that Diocese of the Rev. William Bacon Stevens, D.D., to be Assistant Bishop. It should be remembered that at least some of the Southern Dioceses, Virginia and North Carolina, for example, had not at this time, the beginning of 1862, taken any formal action towards withdrawing

[1] For a noble and most satisfactory statement and vindication of Bishop Polk's case, see Dr. John Fulton's monograph on "The Church in the Confederate States," in Bishop Perry's "History of the American Episcopal Church." Those clergymen, who complacently quote the ancient Canons against a clergyman bearing arms, seem happily unaware of how many other things those ancient Canons deny to the clergy.

from the Church in the United States. The most they had done had been to send delegates to Columbia, to confer with delegates from other Dioceses upon the question. These delegates had agreed that separation should take place, and had prepared and recommended a Constitution for the new organization; but there had been no meetings as yet of the Diocesan Conventions to adopt the proposed Constitution. It is believed that all the Standing Committees, which took action at all, declined to entertain the application from Pennsylvania, and gave their consent to the Consecration of Dr. Wilmer as Bishop of Alabama. And the Bishops, with two exceptions, did the same. These two were the Bishop of Tennessee and the Bishop of North Carolina. Of Bishop Otey we only know that he indicated that his reasons were similar to those alleged by Bishop Atkinson. The Bishop of North Carolina has left on record his view of the case. He was fully persuaded of the expediency, and even necessity, of a separate and independent organization of the Southern Dioceses, by reason of the actual situation of affairs. It was only by such organization that the Church in the South could do the work crying aloud to be done. But he was also fully persuaded that loyalty to Church principles, and therefore regard for the true interests of the Church, required him to recognize no division or separation in the Church, except such as the Church itself should have recognized and sanctioned. In the beginning of the year 1862 his Diocese had not withdrawn from the Church in the United States. It had

contemplated such a step as imminent, and it had endeavored to make preparation to act prudently and wisely, and to provide for the just and proper ordering of the new ecclesiastical body which should be formed. But as yet it had not withdrawn from its old connection, nor entered into any new relationships to take the place of the old. Bishop Atkinson was not a man who could think one way and act another. Alone, as he then supposed, among Southern Bishops he gave his canonical consent to the Consecration of Dr. Stevens, as Assistant Bishop of Pennsylvania, and declined to consent to the Consecration of Dr. Wilmer to be Bishop of Alabama. He was gratified to learn soon afterwards that Bishop Otey had taken the same course. In his judgment he belonged in his old place until he had formally withdrawn with his Diocese. The proposed Constitution had not been ratified by his Diocese of North Carolina, nor by any of the Dioceses, so that Dr. Wilmer could not be consecrated under its sanction; and, in Bishop Atkinson's view, the transmission of the Apostolic office was of too important and sacred a character to be transacted without the fullest sanction of ecclesiastical law, especially when the only reason alleged was to avoid a few months' delay, three or four at the most. The general principle, inherited from the ancient Church, is that no Bishop may be consecrated, without the consent of the Bishop of the Province, thus recognizing the interest of the Church at large in the Episcopate. This principle has had different applications in different

ages and countries. In the American Church its application is seen in the favorable action of the General Convention, or of the Bishops and Standing Committees during the recess of the General Convention, which is required before a Bishop can be consecrated. Bishop Atkinson felt that, in the situation of the Southern Dioceses, it was specially important to observe carefully that which they themselves recognized as the law. Within a few months the Constitution of the Church in the Confederate States would be in force. Until it should be adopted, and until he and his Diocese had acceded to it and ratified it, he could not feel at liberty to act under its provisions. Thus feeling, to a man of his moral and intellectual quality, there was only one course open, and that course he followed.

Bishop Wilmer was consecrated in St. Paul's Church, Richmond, March 6, 1862, by Bishops Meade, Elliott, and Johns. This was Bishop Meade's last official act, and his death was probably hastened by his journey to Richmond for this service, and by the incidental exposure and fatigue. Eight days after the Consecration he died. He had been consecrated in 1829, and had played a very great and honorable part, both in the life of the Church in his own Diocese, and in the history of the Church throughout the United States. By the testimony of all who came within the sphere of his personal influence, he was one of the greatest characters in our history. Bishop Atkinson, who represented almost an opposite type of character

and of Churchmanship, never spoke of him without the strongest expressions of admiration and reverence. In his Address to his Convention of May, 1862, is the following passage: "I have already alluded to the loss we have lately experienced of a Bishop, the oldest of our communion in the Confederate States, and I fully believe one of the wisest and best of all Christendom. I knew him long, and I knew him well, and as I often differed from him in opinion, I can bear the more emphatic testimony of his eminent worth — I have not known, no one of this generation, I believe, has known, a man superior to him in nobleness of nature, in the depth and power of religious principle, in determined zeal for what he believed truth and duty, in devotion to his Maker and his Redeemer, and, as subordinate to these, but as still standing very high in his affections, to the Church of which he was a minister, and the country of which he was a citizen."

The late Rev. Dr. Churchill J. Gibson gives us the following reminiscence of his last illness: "It was my privilege to stand at his bedside until he became unconscious, and to witness his last interview with General Lee. It was eminently characteristic of the men. Visitors had been forbidden by the doctors, but, when the General was announced as having called, the Bishop roused himself, and said, 'I must see him for a few minutes.' The General was brought in by Bishop Johns; and, grasping warmly the extended hand, he said, 'Bishop, how do you feel?' — 'I am almost gone, but I wanted to see you once more.' He

then made inquiries about the members of his family, Mrs. Lee by name, the daughter of his much loved cousin of Arlington, and put several earnest, eager questions about public affairs and the state of the army, showing the liveliest interest in the success of our cause, to all which the General returned brief but satisfactory answers. He then said, 'God bless you! God bless you, Robert, and fit you for your high and responsible position. I can't call you General, I have heard you your Catechism so often.' 'Yes, Bishop,' said the General, as he stooped over him and pressed his hand tenderly (and I think I saw a tear drop), 'very often.' Again our dying Bishop shook his hand warmly, and said, 'Heaven bless you! Heaven bless you, and give you wisdom for your important and arduous duties.' The General then slowly withdrew."

Bishop Meade died on the fourteenth of March. He was taken away in love and mercy, that his eyes might not see the desolations of his Diocese and the sufferings of the people whom he loved.

Within a few months after Bishop Wilmer's Consecration, the Constitution of the Church in the Confederate States was adopted by the Dioceses of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas. Similar action was taken by Arkansas in November, 1862, and by Florida in December, 1863. The Dioceses of Tennessee and Louisiana were unable to hold any Diocesan Conventions until after the close of the War, and so never

became formally united with the Church in the Confederate States. Indeed, the Standing Committee of the Diocese of Tennessee, which managed to keep up its organization, did on October 3, 1864, by giving canonical consent to the Consecration of the Rev. Thomas H. Vail to be Bishop of Kansas, recognize the continuance of their connection with the Church in the United States.

September 27, 1862, Bishop Elliott issued to the Bishops, clergy, and laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States a "*Declaration and Summons*," reciting in full the Constitution proposed by the Convention of October, 1861, and announcing the fact of its ratification and adoption by the Dioceses of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas. As senior Bishop, in accordance with the Third Article of said Constitution, he summoned the first "General Council" of the Church in the Confederate States to meet in Augusta, Georgia, on the second Wednesday of November following.

On the day appointed the Council met in St. Paul's Church, Augusta. Bishops Elliott, Johns, Davis, Atkinson, Lay, and Wilmer were present. Bishop Green appeared the second day, but appeared no more in his place during the session, being confined to his bed with a severe attack of pneumonia. During the session thirty clerical and lay deputies represented seven Dioceses, Texas being unrepresented, but Arkansas being admitted as a Diocese on the eighth

day. Bishop Gregg and his Diocese were cut off by the hostile occupation of the Mississippi River. Tennessee, Louisiana, and Florida had not ratified the Constitution, as has been seen. The Rev. Christian Hanckle, D.D., of South Carolina, was elected President of the House of Deputies, and the Rev. John M. Mitchell, of Alabama, was made secretary. The Rev. W. H. Harrison, of Georgia, was chosen secretary of the House of Bishops.

This General Council, of November 12–22, 1862, was the only one which met during the short life of the Church in the Confederate States. Its time was almost wholly given to the uninteresting but necessary work of enacting a body of Canons for the routine government and administration of the Church. As in the case of the Constitution, this work was in effect only to recast, with some small changes and improvements, the Canons under which the Dioceses had already been living. The whole Canon Law of the General Convention had been codified at Richmond in October, 1859. The changes made in adapting this code to the necessities of the new organization were not great, and do not demand our detailed examination. It has been said, by persons very competent to judge of such matters, that the Canons were somewhat simplified, improved in some details, and reduced to a better and more convenient order. Perhaps the most important change was the omission of the Canon, "Of the use of the Book of Common Prayer." This Canon, adopted in 1832, remained among the Canons

of our General Convention until the revision accomplished in 1904. In the report of the committee to the General Council of 1862 this Canon was brought forward under an enlarged and very much improved form, providing for great freedom and variety in the use of the services of the Prayer Book, in such Dioceses as should authorize the same "by the vote of a majority of both Clergy and Laity," and expressly recognizing the authority of the Bishops of the several Dioceses, to "provide such special services as, in their judgment, shall be required by the peculiar spiritual necessities of any class or portion of the population" of the Diocese. This was a distinct improvement on the rigidity of the old Canon, but it does not seem to have been considered in the Council. The Committee on Canons of the Deputies did not report it, nor does it seem to have been brought up in the House of Bishops. The whole subject of the use of the Book of Common Prayer was omitted from the Canons, and the Prayer Book, as the Church's law and standard of worship, was left to rest upon the constitutional provision that this book should be used in those Dioceses which should adopt the Constitution. In line with this was the omission of the section in the old Digest giving canonical expression to the rubrical direction as to repelling unworthy persons from the Holy Communion. The evident intention was, not to impair the high position and authority of the Book of Common Prayer, by making it appear that its regulations needed to be confirmed and enforced by canonical sanctions. It

was not until forty-two years later that the Church in the United States came to see the wisdom and the logical consistency of this course. The revision accomplished at Boston in 1904 puts the authority of the Prayer Book upon the same constitutional ground, and omits all canonical enforcement of its use. Perhaps it was this same principle, of recognizing in the Prayer Book our only law and directory of public worship, which explains the further omission, from the legislation of the Church in the Confederate States, of the Canon upon the Observance of the Lord's Day, or Sunday, which our own Digest still retains.

Turning now to the practical work of the Church, it is interesting and gratifying to see how the Council, placed in so perilous a position, in the midst of the most tremendous and fateful war of modern times, addressed itself to the demands of the situation.

It is to be noted, first of all, that the Church in the Confederate States did not make its slender resources, and the overwhelming urgency of its domestic duties, a plea for contracting its sympathies or narrowing the bounds of its spiritual horizon; nor did it desire to limit its work within its own diminishing territory. There is something truly pathetic, as well as brave and noble, in the way in which it vainly tried to claim its part in the work of the Master in the distant field of Foreign Missions, from which, in the language of the Pastoral Letter, "the policy of man had shut" it off. To the report of the Committee on the State of the Church were appended the following Resolutions, which

the House of Deputies adopted, as setting forth the position of the Church:

"1. *Resolved*, That the Church in this its first General Council, would solemnly recognize, before the Church universal and the world, a divine obligation to engage in Missionary labor coextensive with the limits of fallen humanity.

"2. *Resolved*, That this Church desires specially to recognize its obligation to provide for the spiritual wants of that class of our brethren, who in the providence of God have been committed to our sympathy and care in the national institution of slavery.

"3. *Resolved*, That whilst at all times a devout recognition of our dependence on the spirit of all grace is proper, this first Council of the Church is a most fitting time and place to make special and public acknowledgment of the same; to encourage among our members the cherishing in increased degree of an habitual sense of His presence and power; and humbly and earnestly to commit to His presiding influence the being, the doings, and the whole future history of this Church, to the end of the world."

The treasurers who had been appointed for Domestic and Foreign Missions in July, 1861, presented their reports. Mr. Henry Trescott, for Foreign Missions, reported funds collected, and several remittances made to Bishop Payne in Africa, Bishop Boone in China, and the Rev. Mr. Hill in Athens. But he reported also that no acknowledgment of his last remittances had been received, and the rate of exchange

and the increased risks of transmission had prevented further remittances being made. The blockade of Southern ports was cutting off the Confederate States from intercourse with the rest of the world. Mr. J. K. Sass, Treasurer for Domestic Missions, reported several thousand dollars contributed, mostly for the work of Bishop Lay and of Bishop Gregg. The Council devolved the work of Foreign and Domestic Missions upon the House of Bishops, as the natural missionary leaders of the Church, providing that the Bishops should appoint three of their number to act as a Board of Missions, administering the whole business, and reporting to the House of Bishops at the triennial General Council. This committee was specially charged with the "prosecuting of Foreign Missions so far as it may be able," but, until communications could be opened with foreign countries, all moneys "which have been, or may be hereafter, contributed for this object, shall be securely invested." In the Pastoral Letter put out by the Bishops at the end of this Council, one of the noblest utterances ever put forth by the Church of Christ in modern times, the Bishops refer to the subject of Foreign Missions: "Voices of supplication come to us also from the distant shores of Africa and the East, but only their echo reaches us from the throne of grace. The policy of man has shut out those utterances from us, . . . but we can hear them when we kneel in prayer, and commune with their spirits through the spirit of Christ. But God is perchance intending through

these inscrutable measures, to shut us up to that great work which He has placed at our doors, and which is, next to her own expansion, the Church's greatest work in these Confederate States. The religious instruction of the negroes has been thrust upon us in such a wonderful manner, that we must be blind not to perceive that not only our spiritual but our national life is wrapped up in their welfare. With them we stand or fall, and God will not permit us to be separated in interest or in fortune." Then follows a long and striking passage, urging upon all members of the Church their duty in regard to this "sacred trust committed to us, as a people, to be prepared for the work which God may have for them to do in the future," and specially urging "upon the masters of the country their obligation, as Christian men, so to arrange this institution as not to necessitate the violation of those sacred relations which God has created, and which man cannot, consistently with Christian duty, annul."

In their Pastoral the Bishops also call attention to the camps and hospitals, into which were crowded so many thousands of the men and youths of the South: "And we would urge it upon those ministers who have been exiled from their parishes, to enter upon this work as their present duty, trusting for support to Him Who has said, 'I will never leave thee nor forsake thee.'"

The General Council of 1862 took action in regard to the Prayer Book, directing the substitution of the

word "Confederate" in the place of "United," wherever that word occurs in the name of the Church, and the word "Council" in the place of "Convention" for the legislative body of the Dioceses and for the general triennial meeting. It also directed that a Declaration of its Ratification and Adoption by the General Council of November, 1862, should be prefixed. A committee, however, was appointed to report to the next General Council such alterations as should be deemed proper, with a *proviso* that "such alterations involve no change in the Doctrine or Discipline of this Church." The committee was authorized to publish an edition of the Prayer Book for present use; "And also, in order to supply in part the urgent need of copies of the Prayer Book for our Soldiers and Sailors, a selection of such portions thereof as are used in public worship."

It is worth noticing that in resolutions introduced by Bishop Atkinson, and apparently urged by him in the "Committee on the Bible and Book of Common Prayer," of which he was chairman, it was provided that the committee, which should be charged with bringing out the edition of the Prayer Book authorized by this Council, should "prepare a preface for said Book of Common Prayer, to be submitted to the next General Council, and, if approved by it, to be prefixed to said Book." This, though adopted by the House of Bishops, was thrown out by the Joint Committee of both Houses, who brought in the report as finally adopted. One can hardly help conjecturing that Bishop Atkinson may have had in mind the statement

in the Preface as to the "ecclesiastical independence" of the Church being "necessarily included" in the civil and political independence of the Thirteen Colonies.

The Committee on the State of the Church suggested the preparation of a Pastoral Letter, and in the House of Bishops, the Bishops of Georgia, Virginia, and North Carolina were appointed to prepare such a letter.[1] Passages relating to missionary work have already been given from it. Its unique excellence tempts me to make larger extracts. Dr. Fulton, in his admirable article in the second volume of Bishop Perry's "History of the American Episcopal Church," thus speaks of it: "The Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops at the Council in Augusta will never cease to be precious to the Church of God. It is the noblest epitaph of the dead, and, if they needed such, it is the noblest vindication of the living, that their dearest friends could wish." It sets forth strongly, yet with tender sympathy and with broad charity, the position, the spirit, and the duty of the Church in that trying day:

"Seldom has any Council assembled in the Church of Christ under circumstances needing His presence more urgently than this which is now about to submit its conclusions to the judgment of the Universal Church. Forced by the providence of God to separate ourselves from the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, a Church with whose doctrines, discipline, and worship we are in entire harmony, and

[1] It is understood to have been written by Bishop Elliott.

with whose action, up to the time of that separation, we were abundantly satisfied, at a moment when civil strife had dipped its foot in blood, and civil war was desolating our homes and firesides, we required a double measure of grace to preserve the accustomed moderation of the Church in the arrangement of our organic law, in the adjustment of our code of canons, but above all in the preservation, without change, of those rich treasures of doctrine and worship, which have come to us enshrined in our Book of Common Prayer. Cut off likewise from all communication with our Sister Churches of the world, we have been compelled to act without any interchange of opinion even with our Mother Church, and alone and unaided to arrange for ourselves the organization under which we should do our part in carrying on to their consummation the purposes of God in Christ Jesus. We trust that the spirit of Christ hath indeed so directed, sanctified, and governed us in our work, that we shall be approved by all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and in truth, and who are earnest in preparing the world for His coming in glorious majesty to judge both the quick and the dead.

"The Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States, under which we have been exercising our legislative functions, is the same as that of the Church from which we have been providentially separated, save that we have introduced into it a germ of expansion which was wanting in the old Constitution. . . .

"The Canon law, which has been adopted during our present session, is altogether in its spirit, and almost in its letter, identical with that under which we have hitherto prospered. . . .

"The Prayer Book we have left untouched in every particular, save where a change of our civil government, and the formation of a new nation, have made alteration essentially requisite. Three words comprise all the amendment which has been deemed necessary in the present emergency. . . . We give you back your Book of Common Prayer the same as you have intrusted it to us, believing that if it has slight defects, their removal had better be the gradual work of experience than the hasty action of a body convened almost upon the outskirts of a camp. . . .

"These striking encouragements vouchsafed to us from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ should fill our hearts with earnest devotedness, and should lead us even now to enquire, 'Lord, what wilt thou have us to do?' And the answer to this question will lead us, your Chief Pastors, to specify the points to which our efforts as a Christian Church, should be specially directed. . . .

"Christ has founded His Church upon love — for God is love. . . . This was His especial commandment, 'A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another.' And this is truly not only the new commandment, but the summary of all the commandments. The whole Gospel is redolent with it, with a broad, comprehensive, all-embracing love, appointed, like Aaron's rod, to swallow up all the other

Christian graces, and to manifest the spiritual glory of God in Christ. A Church without love! What could you augur of a Church of God without faith, or a Church of Christ without hope? But love is higher grace than either faith or hope, and its absence from a Church is just the absence of the very life-blood from the body.

"Our first duty, therefore, as the children of God, is to send forth from this Council our greetings of love to the Churches of God all the world over. We greet them in Christ, and rejoice that they are partakers with us of all the grace which is treasured up in Him. We lay down today before the altar of the Crucified all our burdens of sin, and offer our prayers for the Church Militant upon earth. Whatever may be their aspect towards us politically, we cannot forget that they rejoice with us in the one Lord, the one Faith, the one Baptism, the one God and Father of all; and we wish them God-speed in all the sacred ministries of the Church. Nothing but love is consonant with the exhibition of Christ's love which is manifested in His Church, and any note of man's bitterness, except against sin, would be a sound of discord mingling with the sweet harmonies of earth and heaven. We rejoice in this golden cord, which binds us together in Christ our Redeemer, and like the ladder which Jacob saw in vision, with the angels of God ascending and descending upon it, may it ever be the channel along which shall flash the Christian greeting of the children of God.

"But while we send forth this love to the whole Church Militant upon earth, let us not forget that special love is due by us towards those of our own household. To us have been committed the treasures of the Church, and those of our own kindred and lineage, who have sprung from our loins both naturally and spiritually, who are now united with us in a sacred conflict for the dearest rights of man, ask us for the bread of life. They pray us for that which we are commanded to give, the Gospel of the grace of God. They put in no claim for anything worldly, for anything alien from the mission of the Church. Their petition is that we will fulfil the very purpose of our institution, and give them the means of grace. Every claim which man can have upon his fellow-man they have upon us, and having these claims they ask only for the Church. They pray us not to let them perish in the wilderness; not to permit them to be cut off from the sweet communion of the Church. . . .

"Many of the States of this Confederacy are Missionary ground. The population is sparse and scattered; the children of the Church are few and far between; the Priests of the Lord can reach them only after great labor and privation. . . . Unless we take care that the Gospel is sent to these isolated children of the Church, who will heed their cry? They have no Church to cry to, but the Church which we now represent, and they cast themselves upon us in full faith that we will do our whole duty towards them. They are one with us in faith, and care, and suffering;

they are bearing like evils with those which disturb us, and they have no worship to cheer and support them, no Gospel to preach to them patience and long-suffering. For Christ's sake they pray that they may be given at least a Mother's bosom to die upon. . . .

"And now it only remains for us to bid you, one and all, an affectionate farewell. . . . May God's gracious Providence guide you in safety to your homes, and preserve them from the desolations of war. And should we not be permitted to battle together any more for Christ in the Church Militant, may we be deemed worthy to be members of the Church Triumphant, where with prophets, apostles, martyrs, saints, and angels, we may ascribe honor and glory, dominion and praise, to Him that sitteth upon the Throne, and to the Lamb, forever!"

III

CHURCH WORK IN THE ARMY; SOME CONFEDERATE CHAPLAINS; RELIGIOUS READING FOR THE SOLDIERS; THE "CHURCH INTELLIGENCER"; THE CONFEDERATE PRAYER BOOK.

THE history of the Church in the Confederate States is brief, but it is full of tragic interest, if we could but recover it. And in no part does the life of those times shine out with more blessed and benign influence than in the religious history of the Confederate armies. It has been said that no army since that of Cromwell has been so distinctly and sincerely religious as the "Army of Northern Virginia." And it is no unworthy partiality which claims that the Confederate soldier was free from the evil element of fanaticism and ferocity, which to so great an extent vitiated and degraded the religion of Cromwell's Ironsides. For in truth the Christianity of the Confederate camp and bivouac and battlefield was not the product of the segregated and unnatural life of the soldier. It was simply the religion of family altar, and home circle, and parish church, and country meeting-house, carried by father and son, and brother and friend, from home into the army. Never in any other modern war has the whole male population of a country, from seventeen to fifty years of age, been transported bodily into the camp and the field. And to a great extent

the same moral atmosphere and the same religious standards prevailed in the army to which the soldiers had been accustomed at home. There was doubtless enough of sin and wickedness, as there is more than enough in the best ordered society, but the Confederate Army was no scene of relaxed morals and licensed ungodliness. A distinguished clergyman of the Church, who entered the Confederate Army in 1861 as second lieutenant, and rose to the command of his regiment in Lee's army, who took Holy Orders in 1877, and served as regimental chaplain through the Spanish-American War of 1898, writes:[1] "In regard to the religious condition of the Army of Northern Virginia during the war, so far as my observation extended, I saw but little difference, if any, from what they were at home before and since the war. In fact I should say there was rather more piety manifested by the soldiers during the war than by the same young men before, and decidedly more, I believe, than prevails among the mass of young men today. I was painfully impressed with the contrast between the Confederate soldiers and the Volunteers in the Spanish-American War. I seldom heard an oath in the Confederate camps,[2] and I had every opportunity, from second

[1] The Rev. Edwin A. Osborne, Archdeacon of Charlotte, Colonel of the Fourth Regiment N. C. Troops in the Confederate Army, and Chaplain of the Second Regiment N. C. Volunteers in the Spanish-American War.

[2] As these pages are going through the press the following extract is made from a communication in a Southern newspaper, over the signature of a distinguished Presbyterian minister, the

lieutenant to the command of the regiment. Our camps often resounded at night with hymns and spiritual songs; and arrests for drunkenness were very rare. My own company from North Iredell numbered two hundred and forty men all told during the war, and I do not remember a single arrest among my men, except for one or two old-fashioned 'fisticuffs'; and profanity was seldom heard. In the winter of 1863–4 a very remarkable religious revival swept through

Rev. James Power Smith, who as a young man served on the staff of Stonewall Jackson and of General Richard E. Ewell. His communication is a protest against a popular novelist's representation of Confederate officers as using profane language in their ordinary conversation. He writes: "The frequent introduction of profane language is much to be regretted. These things are not necessary to the story, and not to any such extent true to history. They are to be regretted in a book to be read by many of our boys, as not just to the character of their fathers. The gentlemanly behavior of officers of all ranks repressed any such habits when they came into the army. The few men of prominence who were known to be profane in speech, in times of excitement and passion, themselves felt the repression of the noble men of character and piety who were their leaders, and in later years they left the bad habit behind them.

"General Richard E. Ewell, Jackson's trusted division commander, and his successor in command of the Second Corps, is represented" [by the novelist] "as frequently uttering profane oaths. One who after Jackson's death served on the staff of General Ewell, and was in intimate personal contact with him, is ready to testify that he never heard him utter an oath, but knew him as a Christian gentleman, reverent, devout, and free from any habit of profanity. Losing a leg at Second Manassas, he was for some time an invalid in Richmond, during which time he made a profession of Christ, from which he never declined. There may be those in Richmond who yet remember the day when General Ewell went up the aisle of St. Paul's Church on his crutches and was confirmed."

the army, and thousands of conversions occurred. The army reminded me of regular camp-meeting while in winter quarters, and even on bivouac. Religious exercises were generally well attended by officers and men, without any compulsion, on week-days as well as on Sundays, and the moral and religious atmosphere in the camp was good, remarkably so, as I remember it. How could it be otherwise, with our noble citizen soldiery, and the examples set before them by such men as Lee and Jackson at their head? As for camp-followers and lewd women, they were so rare that I do not remember seeing any of the latter but once, and then they were being carried beyond the reach of the army under a military escort; and there was nothing to attract the former, so far as I can remember, after the winter of 1861–2, when there were some few around Manassas Junction.

"Most of our men had small copies of the Bible or New Testament when they left home; and many of them could be seen reading them when 'at rest' on the march, or in the camp when off duty.

"This may seem somewhat exaggerated, but it is as I remember it. Anything like profanity or immorality was very offensive and painful to me always; and I was seldom shocked during the war by any open manifestation of such a spirit among our soldiers. I do remember a very few instances on the part of individuals that were painful and disgusting, and I would certainly have been impressed if such had been anyways general."

This testimony of a brave and godly soldier, given from memory after the lapse of more than forty years, is confirmed by the contemporary evidence of a faithful chaplain, the Rev. Frederick Fitzgerald, in his report to his Bishop, as published in the Journal of the Diocese of North Carolina for the year 1863. He writes: "I have perceived a constant and real improvement in the moral and religious character of our soldiers since the first nine months of the war. I believe that there is far less of vice of every kind in our army than there was one year ago, and far more seriousness and willingness to read God's Word and hear it explained; far more interest in things that pertain to the soul, about that world where *peace* reigns eternal, and the horrid sound of war is never heard."

This moral and spiritual condition of the army was taken notice of at the time, and was a cause of much satisfaction and confidence among our people. In his Convention Address of 1861 Bishop Meade thus alludes to the subject: "Let me in conclusion commend to [your] special prayers all those who have devoted themselves to the defence of our State. From personal knowledge of many of them, and from the information of others, there is already, I believe, a large portion of religious principle and genuine piety to be found among them. I rejoice to learn that in many companies not only are the services of Chaplains and other Ministers earnestly sought for and after, but social prayer-meetings held among themselves. Our own Church

has a very large proportion of communicants among the soldiers."

The Rev. Dr. Randolph H. McKim, President of the House of Deputies in the General Convention, writes: "I was a private soldier the first year of the war, and used to conduct prayer-meetings among my comrades; had a tent devoted to this purpose. As a staff-officer I used to hold services, did so on the field of battle at Gettysburg. I always found the men receptive. Their moral standard and tone was high, and they had the greatest respect for religion. I served as Chaplain of the 2nd Virginia Cavalry for eight months at the close of the war. I had services twice a day generally, every day in all hard campaigning, and often on the battlefield. There were many communicants. They rallied round me, and there was much religious interest."

These are four witnesses; they might be increased to hundreds. But is anything more needed to show the high level of moral and religious character in the men who made up the Confederate armies?

That this moral and religious improvement was steady and continuous is evidenced in many ways by contemporaneous testimony. *The Church Intelligencer*, of January 8, 1864, has a careful and judicious editorial article upon the condition of religion in the army, in connection with the reports of revival services, so common during that winter. The editor is careful to point out the limitations and qualifications which must be observed in forming a judgment upon the solid

results of such movements. He admits having but little sympathy with the revival system, and is most cautious in calculating its permanent fruits. But he is very clear in his testimony as to the real power of the religious spirit in the army: "Among the best news that comes to us in these troublous times is that of the growing attention to Christian life and duty in our army. . . . From all quarters this intelligence has for months past been coming up to us. . . . A vast improvement has undoubtedly taken place since the commencement of the war — indeed, within the last few months." Many reports of our Clergy of this same period might be quoted to similar purpose. An editorial note in the same paper, April 1, 1864, says that one of our Bishops in the Southwest reports, that during the preceding year he had confirmed more men than women; and he explains this by the strong religious feeling developed among the soldiers: "so many in the army, especially the officers, were coming forward manfully to assume their baptismal promises."

Even more remarkable was the religious character of the professional soldiers who were their leaders. Most of the Confederate generals of the first distinction had been bred to arms, and had been soldiers, and soldiers only, from boyhood. And in many cases they were as eminent for religious character as for military achievements. Lee, Jackson, and Stuart are most prominent examples in the public eye, but they had many like-minded comrades. The publication in 1904 of the familiar letters of General Lee was a reve-

lation even to those most familiar with him in his public character. Seldom has there lived a man who amid the trials and vicissitudes of fortune, in victory and in defeat, in poverty and in wealth, has exhibited such simple, unconscious gentleness, goodness, purity, humility, unruffled sweetness, and serenity of mind and of spirit, as we find in the great Confederate commander. No harsh word was ever heard from his lips, no feeling of bitterness ever invaded his breast. His daily devotions remembered before God both friend and foe,[1] and his great heart took up as its own the burden of all faults and failures of others, while it generously assigned to them the praises due to his own great deeds. The Church in the Confederate States has given to the world the most perfect character, exhibited by any great historical figure of modern times, in *Robert Edward Lee*. And in their lesser measure many of his soldiers, officers and men, followed after his noble example of Christian faith and conduct.

Numberless instances and references might be given to illustrate the general prevalence of religious feeling and principle, as exhibited in the daily habits of officers and men. In Dr. Packard's "Recollections of a Long

[1] This fact, commonly reported and believed in the South, that General Lee was accustomed to remember in his private prayers the soldiers of the armies opposed to him, along with his own devoted followers, led to the introduction of a like petition into the prayers licensed for use in the Diocese of North Carolina during the Spanish-American War of 1898, and in turn caused these prayers to be copied and used in other and distant Dioceses:

"*So shines a good deed in a naughty world.*"

Life" we read: "I went to the camp at Manassas to see my son Joseph.[1] I slept one night in my son's tent on the soft side of a board. It was the custom of this company to have prayers at the dawn of day, and next morning I was asked to officiate, and made a prayer. It was too early to see to read. The scene was a thrilling one. It was a remarkable company, composed largely of college and theological students." At the bottom of the same page: "I saw him" [General Pendleton] "once again, when I went to his headquarters at sunrise the next morning to get a furlough for my son, who was sick. He was standing by a fire out of doors reading his Bible." And a few lines further on: "My son remembers that Jackson came round early one morning, and looking in the tent gave him a tract." General Lee gave as many Prayer Books as he could get to his soldier friends." The Rev. J. Wm. Jones, in his book "Christ in the Camp," mentions that a bookseller in Richmond, when General Lee was buying Prayer Books in his store, offered him a dozen copies for the old one which he had carried for many years in his pocket. General Lee gladly made the exchange, saying that he would give the additional books to his soldiers.

In the report of the Committee on the State of the Church, in the Diocesan Convention of Virginia in 1863, we are told that, "The army is like a field white for the harvest. From the Commanding General down

[1] Mr. Joseph Packard, since one of the most eminent members of the General Convention.

to the unknown private, there is extended a hearty welcome to the message of the gospel, and to him who brings it. The influence of our own Church, though silent and unostentatious, is unmistakable." In his Address to the same Convention, Bishop Johns says: "A youthful chaplain, who with a few others formed a committee to confer with the lamented Jackson on the subject of ministerial supply for the soldiers, found him with his staff engaged in a prayer-meeting. When its solemn exercises were concluded, he asked the young chaplain to say to me that there were forty vacant chaplaincies in the Army of the Rappahannock, and to beg me to send some of our clergy to visit the camp and render those ministerial services which were greatly needed and earnestly desired. . . . Within the last week I was unexpectedly privileged with a brief interview with his surviving friend and brother in arms, the Commander-in-Chief. . . . From his lips I received an appeal in perfect consonance with the last message of his lamented colleague — an earnest request for special ministerial services for the army, accompanied by the statement that their condition is most favorable for religious improvement." In response to this appeal the Convention passed unanimously a resolution, requesting the Bishop to call upon those clergymen who were without parishes for this service, but also pledging the whole body of the clergy to answer his call.

It is unfortunate that so little should have been done to preserve a record of the work of our chaplains

in the Confederate service. The only book, professing to be a history of religion in the Army of Northern Virginia,[1] is by a Baptist minister, whose conception of religious experience was so strictly limited to that peculiar phase associated with the ordinary revival, that he seldom notices any kind of Christian work not in line with that which appealed specially to himself. It is noticeable that, even in his book, some of the most beautiful examples of Christian faith and heroism are young Virginia Churchmen, and he does justice to the Christian character of all such, who come under his notice. There seems to be no designed or conscious unfairness in his treatment, but perhaps naturally the work of our chaplains did not specially appeal to him or attract his attention.

The Church sent many of her best and ablest Priests as chaplains to the army. Four who became Bishops after the War were commissioned chaplains, and devoted in their service, Bishop Quintard of Tennessee, Bishop Watson of East Carolina, Bishop Randolph of Southern Virginia, and Bishop Gray of Southern Florida. Bishop Beckwith of Georgia, though not a regular chaplain, did volunteer work as a chaplain in the Army of Tennessee during the summer of 1864.

As in so many other things, so Virginia stands first in the number of chaplains, sending a total of twenty-nine during the War from her one hundred and fifteen clergymen. North Carolina came next, with fifteen chaplains from her total of fifty-three diocesan clergy.

[1] "Christ in the Camp," by the Rev. J. Wm. Jones.

Georgia gave six; Mississippi, five; Tennessee, three; Louisiana and Texas, each two; and South Carolina, Florida, and Alabama, one each. These numbers are the result of my best efforts to ascertain the names of our regular chaplains in the army. Many, however, served temporarily and irregularly, and doubtless some in State organizations, whose names do not appear. Several from South Carolina are known to have served in this way, notably the Rev. A. Toomer Porter and the Rev. T. S. Arthur. The Rev. Robert W. Barnwell, of that Diocese, sacrificed his life in devoted attention to the sick and wounded soldiers in the army hospitals in Virginia. In the later stages of the War several of the Dioceses, notably Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, took measures to send their parochial clergy for stated periods to the army, to serve as chaplains in turn, under the systematic direction of the Bishop. The diocesan Journal of Alabama contains some interesting reports of clergymen thus employed. The Bishops themselves, as opportunity offered, were not slow to give their services; especially is this true of the Bishop of Georgia and the Bishop of Virginia. Bishop Lay seemed in a fair way to become something like a "Chaplain General" in the Army of Tennessee. Being by the course of hostilities prevented from working in Arkansas, he gave much of his time to work in our Western Army, and naturally became a sort of head and leader for such of our Church clergymen as were serving, either regularly or temporarily, as chaplains in that army. They found much

comfort and help in so able and sympathetic a counsellor; and diocesan Bishops, sending their parochial clergy for terms of a few months, were glad to commend them to his care, and to require them to report to him upon their army service. An Augusta paper of that period gives an interesting article illustrating the perils and the rewards of that arduous work:

"We are enabled to lay before our readers the following extracts from a letter of Bishop Lay to a relative in this city, not designed for publication. Bishop Lay is now employed in missionary labor with the army in Georgia under General Hood:

" 'Yesterday in Strahl's brigade I preached and confirmed nine persons. Last night we had a very solemn service in General Hood's room, some forty persons, chiefly Generals and Staff Officers, being present. I confirmed General Hood and one of his Aides, Captain Gordon, of Savannah, and a young Lieutenant from Arkansas. The service was animated, the praying devout. Shells exploded near by all the time. General Hood, unable to kneel, supported himself on his crutch and staff, and with bowed head received the benediction. Next Sunday I am to administer the Communion at headquarters. To-night ten or twelve are to be confirmed in Clayton's division. The enemy are within two hundred and fifty yards of our line, and the firing is very constant. I fear it will be hard to get the men together.

" 'I wish you could have been present last night to have seen that company down, all on bended knee.

The reverence was so marked that one could not fail to thank God that He had put such a spirit into the hearts of our leaders.'

"We are requested to add that Bishop Lay is admirably supported in his labors by the Rev. Dr. Quintard, who as Chaplain and Surgeon ministers to the body and mind, and than whom no man is better known in the army. To serve it he has given his time, and sacrificed nearly the whole of his property.

"Bishop Lay writes of him: 'I am told that he could not leave the army; he is better than any man in it. Everybody knows him, and comes to him for counsel. There is no Chaplain comparable to him in point of usefulness, and he cannot possibly be spared.

" 'It is proposed to establish an Ecclesiastical Headquarters to move with the army, to have stated services, to be always accessible, to supply books and tracts, to receive the Clergy and show them how to go to work. General Johnston earnestly endorsed this plan, and General Hood will furnish all facilities for carrying it out.' "

The Confederate States government did not come up to the measure of its duty to its army chaplains. They had no rank assigned to them, and no uniform prescribed, and were practically left to make a place for themselves, though this disadvantage was largely remedied by the personal respect and affection felt for them by both officers and men. Their pay was fifty dollars and the ration of a private soldier. This was especially hard on the Virginia and North Caro-

lina chaplains, for before being mustered into the Confederate service they had, in the military organization of their States, enjoyed the rank of major, and their pay was one hundred and fifty dollars. Towards the end of the War, some time in 1864, their pay was by an act of the Confederate Congress raised to eighty dollars in the depreciated and depreciating currency of the time, and they were allowed forage for a horse, in case they were so fortunate as to have one. They were also allowed a small amount of stationery. It was alleged in the newspapers at the time, that the smallness of the pay, at first allowed by the Confederate government, had been due to a Member of Congress, who argued that, as the chaplain had no duty but to preach on Sunday, he might well earn his living by working during the week, acting as sutler in the army, and the like. This worthy legislator belonged to a religious sect which does not require pastoral services of its ministers, but confines their function to the one duty of preaching. This meanness in the government caused much distress to those faithful chaplains who had no private fortune; and some of the best of them were thus forced to return to parochial work, as their only means of obtaining a bare subsistence. But the poorly paid chaplain, marching on foot with the men, is not the least heroic figure of that heroic time.

Perhaps Bishop Quintard was the most effective of all our chaplains, and he is the only one who has left any adequate record of his work. His brief biography,

published in 1905 by the Rev. Arthur Howard Noll, is in effect largely the personal narrative of his experience as chaplain, and it is well worth reading. Bishop Quintard was a remarkable man in many ways, and perhaps his many striking and attractive qualities were most fully and admirably displayed in his work in the army. He seemed to be everywhere, to see everything, and to know everybody. Quick in movement, in apprehension, in sympathy; affectionate, generous; a skilled physician and surgeon, as well as a devout and ardent Christian Priest, he made for himself a place in the hearts and minds of the soldiers of the Army of Tennessee, and by a natural, and all but necessary, transition became their Bishop when he could no longer be their chaplain. His personal narrative is of fascinating interest. Whether administering the Holy Communion to the officers and men of the *Merrimac*, before their famous fight in Hampton Roads; or working fourteen hours as surgeon, without cessation, after a bloody battle, amputating limbs, dressing wounds, tearing his very shirt into strips to use as bandages, and then leaning against the rail-fence and weeping like a child from sheer nervous exhaustion; or demanding an interview with the severe and sarcastic General Bragg upon "*a matter of life and death*," that he might speak to him of his duty to confess Christ, and bringing tears into those hard eyes, as the general in command of the army surrenders to the soldier of the Cross; — he is always the same vital, generous, brave, and loving soul, giving freely

all he has to give, and getting everything which any one else has to give. He mentions baptizing six generals, and presenting a number for Confirmation; among the latter Generals Bragg, Hood, Hardee, and two unnamed, one of whom, I cannot help thinking, must have been General Joseph E. Johnston, who is mentioned as having been baptized a few days before by Bishop Polk.

One of the noblest men who served in the Confederate Army was the late Bishop Watson, of East Carolina. Though a native of Brooklyn, New York, he had lived in the South since his early manhood, and had been ordained Priest by Bishop Ives in 1845. He was one of the first of his Diocese to offer himself for service in the army, resigning one of the largest parishes in the Diocese to become chaplain of the 2d North Carolina Infantry Regiment in the summer of 1861. Frail in body, he was indomitable of soul, and during the fiercest battle he was more apt to be found among the wounded and dying between the hostile lines than in any safer place. "Mr. Watson, go to the rear with the wounded, Sir!" commanded his colonel, as the chaplain pressed forward beyond the line towards the wounded men lying in front. "I think I know my duty, Sir," replied the chaplain without pausing; and there was that in his eye which would not be turned back. I had this incident from the lips of the colonel [1] who was thus disobeyed. At the battle of Williamsburg, one of the first in which his regiment

[1] Colonel William L. DeRosset.

was engaged, when many dead and wounded had been left between the lines, and shot and shell still played across the bloody field, General Magruder asked: "Who is that little man there in front among the wounded?" "The Rev. Mr. Watson, chaplain of the 2d North Carolina," was the reply. "Then tell him to come and take command of the troops," exclaimed Magruder, "for he is a braver man than I am."[1]

The Rev. Alfred M. Randolph, since Bishop of Southern Virginia, was driven out of his house, with his wife and their infant a day old, by the bombardment of Fredericksburg; and being thus without a parish became a chaplain in the army, displaying the most devoted, single-minded courage and zeal on the battle-field among the wounded, under the fire of the enemy, and in the sorer trials of ministering in the crowded field and post hospitals. The Rev. William Meredith, of Virginia, was among the most faithful chaplains, only it was said that he always forgot he was a chaplain during the battle, and took his place in the fighting line until the battle was over, when he would resume his ministrations to the wounded and dying. The Rev. Edward T. Perkins, after the War a very distinguished clergyman of Kentucky, and for many years Deputy from that Diocese to the General Convention, was a chaplain loved and honored throughout the Army of Northern Virginia. During the last days of

[1] I had understood that this happened at Malvern Hill, but Bishop Strange tells me it was at Williamsburg.

its glorious history, during the investment of Petersburg, he would crawl during the night from picket-post to picket-post, to pray with the men on this arduous duty, and to help them by words of sympathy and cheer.

The Rev. George Patterson, chaplain of the 3d North Carolina Infantry, was one of the most faithful and beloved of all our clergy in the army, and a man of striking, not to say eccentric, personality. He acted out his strong feelings and convictions with a perfect frankness and simplicity, which sometimes produced surprising situations; but his absolute sincerity and the goodness of his honest heart carried him to the hearts of the soldiers. He read the Burial Service over Colonel H. Allen Brown, of the First North Carolina Regiment, on the bloody field of Spottsylvania, when he thought him *in articulo mortis*, as the exigencies of the situation would not allow of his remaining with the dying man, to whom he felt that he ought to give the last rites of the Church which he loved. One account has it that the colonel, consenting to the service, made the proper responses to the chaplain's prayers. They were both most deadly in earnest, and it is hard to imagine a nobler example of Christian faith and devotion — the heroic soldier stricken with the hand of death, as he believes, and his friend and pastor, unable to remain that he may close his eyes, yet saying over the dying man the solemn Office of the Dead, to which his failing voice cries "Amen"! In fact, Colonel Brown survived and is living today in

Columbia, Tennessee; and his faithful and godly life has well illustrated that strange experience of trial and Christian fortitude.

This same "Father Patterson" was a rigid Churchman and disciplinarian. Being in winter quarters, a distinguished Presbyterian divine, attached to General Jackson's staff, thought to *Episcopate* mildly, by making appointments to visit the several regiments, to preach to the soldiers, and to confer with the chaplains upon their spiritual interests. In the course of this visitation he sent due notice to Mr. Patterson of a visit to his regiment. Upon the appointed day the visiting divine arrived, but found no preparations made for preaching. Enquiring for the chaplain, Mr. Patterson appeared and informed him that, as he was not aware that he had any authority to preach in that regiment, he had not regarded his notice, and did not propose to let him preach. The visitor retired discomfited, and made complaint to General Jackson. Riding through the camp a few days after this, General Jackson saw Mr. Patterson standing in the door of his tent. Drawing rein before the tent he asked if he were not speaking to the Rev. Mr. Patterson, chaplain of the 3d North Carolina Regiment. Mr. Patterson saluted his General, and replied in the affirmative. "The Rev. Dr. —— tells me," said Jackson, "that you refused to let him preach to your men." "I did," replied the chaplain. "Why did you object to his preaching?" inquired the General. "He could have done them no harm; and he might have done them

some good." Mr. Patterson looked fixedly at Jackson for a moment, with a singularly penetrating gaze very characteristic of him, and then asked in his quick, earnest manner: "General Jackson, do you want any one to help you to command this army corps?" "No, Sir," replied Jackson very emphatically, "I do not." "Well," said Mr. Patterson, "and I don't want anybody to help me to be chaplain of this regiment." General Jackson in turn gazed at the chaplain for a moment, with perhaps a suspicion of humor in his gray eye: "Good-morning, Mr. Patterson," he said, and rode on. The story is characteristic of both men. I had it from a prominent lawyer of North Carolina, who was a soldier in Mr. Patterson's regiment.

At a famous review of the Army of Northern Virginia, in June, 1863, just prior to General Lee's advance into Pennsylvania, Mr. Patterson marched in his place with his regiment, in surplice and stole, and with his Prayer Book in hand. "When the regiment passed General Lee, he acknowledged its salute in a very marked manner, bowing to his saddlebow with bared head. When asked why he did so, he replied: 'I salute the Church of the living God.'" [1]

The faithful chaplains, who so fearlessly exposed themselves in ministering to the bodily and spiritual necessities of the wounded and dying upon the battlefield, did not always escape injury, though it is to be presumed that they were never purposely molested.

[1] I give this incident on the authority and in the written words of the late Major Graham Daves.

Bishop Green in his Convention Address of 1862, after speaking of the death of Bishop Meade, thus refers to that of one of his clergy, the Rev. M. Leander Weller: "Far different were the dying circumstances of our young soldier-brother Weller. His spirit went up on high from the midst of the battlefield, but he was not unprepared for that rude and sudden call. He had gone into the ranks, and patiently borne the toils and privations of the common soldier, for the purpose of getting nearer to the hearts of his comrades in arms. After distinguishing himself for uncommon bravery and the faithful performance of all his duties, he was appointed chaplain of his Regiment, with the prospect of much usefulness before him. But the measure of his days was near its end. On the memorable field of Shiloh he fell in the thickest of the fight. Thus passed from amongst us a man in whom were blended the simplicity of the child, the purity and gentleness of a woman, the dauntless courage of the soldier, and the unaffected piety of the Christian."

In *The Church Intelligencer* of June 13, 1862, is this following item of news: "The Rev. L. H. Jones, of San Antonio, Texas, we learn, fell sorely wounded at the battle of Glorietta, while bending with a white flag in his hand, over the body of a dying soldier, to whom he was ministering the comforts of religion." [1]

[1] This brave chaplain did not die of the wound thus received, though none the less he sacrificed his life in the service. Bishop Gregg says of him: "The Rev. L. H. Jones, Chaplain of Reily's Regiment, died October last [1863]. He was assiduous in the discharge of every duty, ministering to all alike, even where danger

A very important part of Church work for the soldiers was in supplying them with religious reading and, indeed, with proper reading of any character. To meet this necessity all the different religious bodies made noble exertions. In our own communion the leader in this enterprise seems to have been the Virginia Diocesan Missionary Society. They are said to have printed and distributed many thousands of pages of tracts. Their "Soldier's and Sailor's Prayer Book" will be mentioned later.

In South Carolina a society called the "Protestant Episcopal Church Female Bible, Prayer Book, and Tract Society" had been in operation for many years. This became a useful agency in circulating Bibles, Prayer Books, and tracts among the soldiers. Most of their work was necessarily devoted to supplying the camps and hospitals near Charleston, where many thousands of soldiers were collected; but we have evidence that they sent their benefactions both to Virginia and to the Army of Tennessee. They imported tracts from England, the old familiar works of Hannah More and Leigh Richmond; they published many themselves suitable for the soldiers: "Prayer," "Faithfulness," "Christian Soldier," "Watching and Sleeping Christianity," "The Narrow Way," "Sunday Morning Dream," "Roll Call," "A few Words to the Soldiers of the Confederate States," "Prayers and

threatened most, winning the universal confidence and affection of the command. After a long course of hardship and exposure he died, where he would have wished to die, at the post of duty."

other Devotions for the Use of the Soldiers," etc. Bibles, Prayer Books, and thousands of these and other tracts, were distributed in camp and fort and hospital. Public calamities and private suffering put an end to the operations of this Society before the end of the War, but not before it had done immense service.

Bishop Quintard gives a pathetic incident, connected apparently with the work of this Society, whose agent was Mr. J. K. Sass, of Charleston, one of the most prominent laymen of South Carolina, and the Treasurer, as has been said, for Domestic Missions in the Confederate States, and also Treasurer of the General Council. Bishop Quintard states that in 1864 he prepared two small books for the use of the soldiers, one as a sort of substitute for the Prayer Book for private use, the other called "Balm for the Weary and Wounded." He says: "It was through the great kindness and generosity of Mr. Jacob K. Sass, the Treasurer of the General Council of the Church in the Confederate States, that I was enabled to publish these two little volumes. The first four copies of the latter booklet that came from the press were forwarded to General Polk, and he wrote upon three of them the names of General J. E. Johnston, Lieutenant-General Hardee, and Lieutenant-General Hood, respectively, and 'With the compliments of Lieutenant-General Leonidas Polk, June 12, 1864.' They were taken from the breast-pocket of his coat, stained with his blood, after his death, and forwarded to the officers for whom he had intended them."

Early in the year 1864 there was formed in Charlotte, N.C., "The Protestant Episcopal Church Publishing Association" for the purpose of supplying religious literature for circulation in the army. So far as can now be ascertained this Association consisted of one godly and generous layman, John Wilkes, of St. Peter's Church, Charlotte, and his rector, the Rev. George M. Everhart. Mr. Wilkes was treasurer and Mr. Everhart "Book and Tract Editor." No. 1 of its series of tracts, and much the longest of them, was Bishop Lay's "Letters to a Man Bewildered among many Counsellors." Next came a sermon by Bishop Wilmer, "Future Good." A bundle of the briefer ones, on dirty-brown Confederate paper, shows the following titles, as specimens, "Fragments for the Sick," "The Repentance of Judas," "The Doubting Christian Encouraged," "There's a Good Time Coming," "Prayers for the Sick and Wounded," two "On Confirmation," "Profane Swearing," "Repentance of David," by Dr. Pusey, "The Day of Adversity." Later we find Bishop Quintard's notable little army tracts: "Balm for the Weary and Wounded," and "Nellie Peters' Pocket Handkerchief." There were later added "The Church Catechism Simplified," a "Catechism for very Young Children and Servants," and "Tracts for Children." This Association seems to have done the most extensive work of its kind which was done by the Church in the South. Their orders came from all the States of the South, from Virginia to Mississippi. In one issue of *The Church Intelligencer*

they acknowledge the receipt of over ten thousand dollars, contributed from different Dioceses, parishes, and individuals, for the distribution of tracts in the army and the hospitals. This was in Confederate money, and it was probably the total amount of all receipts up to that date, but even so it indicates a very considerable amount of work. In Bishop Wilmer's Address to his Convention of 1864, speaking of the difficulty of procuring religious books for the army, he says that he has made arrangements with *The Church Intelligencer*, published in Charlotte, for a regular supply of tracts; and after communications became so interrupted that they could not be delivered in Alabama, he directed them to be sent to Bishop Lay in North Carolina for use among the soldiers. Thus as the War went on, the Church through her faithful clergy and laity endeavored to meet its varied demands; and especially the heart of the people went out to the brave soldiers, and all their slender resources were taxed to the uttermost to meet the spiritual needs of the army.

In this connection it is proper to mention *The Church Intelligencer*, published in Raleigh from March, 1860, until April 1, 1864, when under the increasing difficulties of the times it suspended publication. In September of the same year it was revived in Charlotte, and continued to be issued regularly until March, 1867. It is a most valuable repository of the history of the Church in the Confederate States, and may be said to

have been in effect the official organ of that Church. It took its origin, in the first instance, as we learn from the letter of a most intelligent correspondent [1] in its first number, at a conference in Richmond, during the General Convention of 1859, of the Southern Bishops associated together in the establishment of the University of the South. It seemed to them desirable that some Church paper should represent their great enterprise, and afford them a ready means of bringing their purposes and their work before the Churchmen of the South. They therefore conferred together in Richmond, and determined to establish such a paper. Raleigh was agreed upon as the place of publication, and two North Carolina clergymen, the Rev. Thomas S. W. Mott and the Rev. Harry F. Green, respectively "Proprietor and Editor," undertook to carry on the work. Mr. Green wrote the opening editorial, but died two weeks before the appearance of the first number. His place was supplied by the Rev. Frederick Fitzgerald. Mr. Fitzgerald, after something more than a year's service, retired to become a chaplain in the Confederate Army, and the Rev. Mr. Mott acted as editor until the suspension of the paper in April, 1864. It was the recognized official organ of the Bishops of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and Tennessee, and of the University

[1] I think I am not mistaken in identifying this anonymous correspondent with the Rev. Dr. Aldert Smedes, of St. Mary's School, Raleigh.

of the South. Its circulation extended over all the territory reached by the mail service of the Confederate States, and it contains such a collection of official reports of Bishops and Conventions, news-letters by correspondents, communications from prominent clergymen and laymen upon questions of general and local Church interest, as can be found nowhere else. Except the *Southern Churchman*, published in Virginia and circulating chiefly in that Diocese, and the *Southern Episcopalian*, published irregularly in Charleston, it was our only Church paper in the South, and presents in its contents a wide variety of interesting information and able discussion. As its means of gathering news from beyond the limits of the South became more and more restricted, by the increasing strength and efficiency of encompassing hostile armies and fleets, instead of narrowing its view to purely local interests, it took up questions of history, of Church polity, and of literature, giving original articles and sometimes translations of ancient authors. A very scholarly series upon English Religious Poetry included long and appreciative articles upon Robert Herrick, Henry Vaughan, Robert Southwell, and others; another series treated of the Apostolic Fathers Clement and Ignatius, with translations from some of their Epistles; and many articles, both original and selected, dealt with subjects less strictly ecclesiastical. And there is no lack of darker pictures of the bloodshed, poverty, and destruction which in all directions drew a steadily contracting line of horror around our devoted land.

The Church of the Confederate States has no cause to feel ashamed of its paper, *The Church Intelligencer.*

About the time that the Rev. Mr. Mott in the spring of 1864 had to discontinue its publication, "The Protestant Episcopal Church Publishing Association" began its work in Charlotte, as has been mentioned. Upon the urgent solicitation of the Bishop of North Carolina, and of prominent clergymen and laymen of that and other Dioceses, this Association undertook to revive *The Church Intelligencer*, and September 14, 1864, the first member of the new series appeared, with the Rev. Professor Fordyce M. Hubbard and the Rev. George M. Everhart as editors, and the Association, i.e. John Wilkes, as publisher. Under this new management the paper, though smaller in size, maintained, and even increased, its high standard of excellence. Prof. Hubbard held the chair of Latin at the University of North Carolina, but was also an accomplished English scholar; and this little sheet, upon dingy Confederate paper, in point of literary excellence compares favorably with the best of our Church papers of today. It continued for two years and a half, under the new management, to serve a valuable purpose in the life of the Church in the South, its last issue appearing in March, 1867, seven years almost to a day from the date of its first number. During the last year of its publication the editor of a leading New York literary journal, in estimating the quality of the religious press of the United States in point of intellectual and literary ability, assigned to

The Church Intelligencer a place in the first rank of the religious periodicals of the country.[1]

The General Council at Augusta had appointed a committee to report to its next meeting such changes in the Prayer Book, not affecting doctrine or discipline, as might seem desirable, and authorized in the meantime to publish an edition of the Prayer Book for present use. They were also authorized to print, for special use in the army and navy, a compendium, for public worship, of certain parts of the Prayer Book most commonly used. The only action of this committee, so far as is now known, was to carry out the last of the above directions, by publishing a pamphlet of forty-eight pages, printed at Atlanta in 1863 by R. J. Maynard, containing, in a novel but very convenient arrangement, Morning and Evening Prayer, the Litany, the Ante-Communion, certain selected "Prayers and Thanksgivings," six of the "Selections of Psalms," the "Office for the Burial of the Dead," "Prayers to be used at Sea," and a small number of the "Psalms in Metre" and Hymns from the old Prayer Book collection. Morning and Evening Prayer were shortened by the omission of alternative forms, as, one of the forms of Absolution, the Nicene Creed, etc.; and there was introduced into Morning Prayer the

[1] I was at the time a student in Trinity College, Hartford, and remember distinctly the above statement being made to me by Professor, now Bishop, Niles, with the name of the paper and its editor, though neither he nor I can now recall them.

"Third Selection of Psalms," and into Evening Prayer the "Sixth Selection." What is called "the Lesser Litany" was also omitted. Apparently only a small edition was printed, and it seems to have been little used or known.

The Missionary Society of the Diocese of Virginia put out a similar publication, called "The Army and Navy Prayer Book." The first edition was of 10,000 copies, and was published in 1862 or 1863, Macfarlane & Furgusson, of Richmond, being the printers; and is spoken of by Bishop Johns in his Convention Address as, "A manual of public services and private devotions taken from our Book of Common Prayer, with a selection of Psalms and Hymns — printed for the special use of our soldiers." Within a year or so after this edition had appeared, another, of 25,000 copies, was printed for the Society by Charles H. Wynne, of Richmond. This little book, bound in heavy brown paper and of a size to be carried in the pocket, contained three short services. The first service was an abbreviated form of Morning (or Evening) Prayer, with seven Psalms from the Psalter appended; the second was the Litany, with brief introductory sentences and exhortation; the third was made up mostly of extracts from the Ante-Communion Office; then followed sixteen "occasional prayers," the Office of Confirmation; and last a small selection of Metrical Psalms and a number of Hymns, mostly taken from the collection at that time bound up with the Prayer Book.

Three editions of the "Confederate Prayer Book"

are known to have been printed by Eyre & Spottiswoode, of London, in 1863, upon orders from the South. They are quite different in type, size, and binding, but were evidently put out about the same time and under the same direction or supervision. They have not the formal "Ratification and Adoption" prescribed to be used by the committee authorized by the General Council of November, 1862, to publish the Prayer Book, and must therefore have been published without the sanction of that committee, and as a matter of private enterprise or zeal. They have all the same errors, the words "United States" being left unchanged in the Prayers to be used at Sea, and in the Promise of Conformity made by the Bishop-Elect, in the Office for the Consecration of a Bishop. The Metrical Psalms and Hymns appended to the book are introduced by the same joint-resolution of "the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

The largest and the smallest in size of these editions, the one a 24mo, *long primer*, the other about a 64mo, were printed for a Richmond publisher, and have on their title-page: "Richmond, Virginia; J. W. Randolph"; but upon the reverse of the title-page we read: "London: — Printed by G. E. Eyre and W. T. Spottiswoode." The only copies of these books, which the writer has been able to see or to hear of, have been in the North, or have been brought from the North. One of the smallest of these books is included in a Catalogue of Prayer Books exhibited at the Boston

Public Library in 1906, and there is appended in the catalogue a note to the effect that, "About four hundred copies were sent out in the Blockade Runner *Robert E. Lee*, and captured off Wilmington, N. C., and sold at prize sale in Boston, December 1863." The only copy of the larger book, 24mo, *long primer*, ever seen by the writer, was given to the Rev. McNeely DuBose, of Asheville, by a lady, who wrote upon an inserted fly-leaf: "This book with many others, was thrown from a Blockade runner, while being pursued by a Federal gunboat during the war of 1861–1865. It was given me by an officer of the gunboat." It is not an unreasonable conjecture that the blockade runner thus pursued was the same *Robert E. Lee* mentioned in the preceding note, and that part of the consignment of Prayer Books to J. W. Randolph, Richmond, were lost, and the rest captured and sold at prize sale. So far as can be ascertained, none of them came into use in the South during the War.

The third of these Confederate Prayer Books, printed at the same time by the same firm, having only their name on the title-page, and showing exactly the same errors, is intermediate in size between the two, being about a 48mo, somewhat less expensively finished, bound in dark leather, with a plain Roman Cross stamped on the front cover. These books were brought through the blockade to Wilmington, N. C., upon an order sent out by a number of North Carolina clergymen, who agreed to send a bale of cotton, or the price thereof, from their several parishes, that the

cotton might be sent through the blockade and sold in England, and the proceeds invested in Bibles and Prayer Books. A memorandum of the purchase and shipment of the cotton, in the handwriting of the late Dr. Armand J. DeRosset, an eminent Churchman and citizen of Wilmington, who purchased and shipped the cotton, is extant, preserved by the late Bishop Watson. The persons concerned in this transaction were the Rev. Dr. Richard S. Mason, of Christ Church, Raleigh; the Rev. Joseph Blount Cheshire, of Trinity Church, Scotland Neck; the Rev. Alfred A. Watson, of St. James Church, Wilmington; the Rev. Joseph C. Huske, of St. John's Church, Fayetteville; and the Rev. Robert B. Sutton, of St. Bartholomew's Church, Pittsboro. Mr. John Wilkes, of Charlotte, and Dr. Armand J. DeRosset also contributed to the fund for the purchase of the five bales of cotton which were sent. This venture proved more fortunate than that of the Richmond publisher. The number of books purchased is not known, but they came safe through the blockade, and were eagerly sought for and used. Many of them were sent to the soldiers in the army, and a small number were sent to each of the parishes contributing towards their purchase. All known copies of this edition were used in the South during the War, and it was really the only edition of a "Confederate Prayer Book" known in the Confederacy.

It is probable that all these books were printed from existing plates of Eyre & Spottiswoode, the word "*Confederate*" being substituted for the word "United"

in Morning and Evening Prayer, and in the Prayer for Congress, the only places where the word occurs in the services in common use. If new types had been set up, the other places would probably have been noted and corrected. It was perhaps not an unhappy chance which left the word "*United*" in as many places as those where it was changed. It is significant of the fact that the separation of the Church in the South was only such as practical necessity made unavoidable — and *that it changed as little as possible of its usages and traditions.*

CHAPLAINS IN THE CONFEDERATE ARMY

List of Clergymen of the Church who served as Chaplains in the Army of the Confederate States

The following list is doubtless incomplete, but it contains the names of all whom I can find any notice of, or hear of after inquiry.

Diocese of Virginia

1. Rev. Thomas M. Ambler
2. " James B. Avirett
3. " R. J. Baker
4. " T. M. Boyd .....4th N. C.
5. " James Carmichael
6. " John Cole .....in Hospital
7. " J. Cosby
8. " R. T. Davis .....6th Va. Cavalry
9. " Thomas Duncan .....Md. Line
10. " Wm. H. Gardner .....24th Va.
11. " R. Gatewood
12. " John Griffin .....19th Va.
13. " J. C. McCabe
14. " John McGill .....52d Va.
15. " John P. McGuire

16. Rev. Randolph H. McKim .....2d Va. Cavalry
17. " M. Maury
18. " W. C. Meredith
19. " G. H. Norton
20. " Edward T. Perkins
21. " Alfred M. Randolph
22. " P. G. Robert .....2d La., 4th Va. Artl.
23. " C. P. Rodifer
24. " Aristides S. Smith .....11th N. C.
25. " Thompson L. Smith
26. " K. J. Stewart
27. " P. Tinsley
28. " Lyman B. Wharton
29. " George T. Williams

Diocese of North Carolina

1. Rev. Jarvis Buxton .....Asheville Hosp.
2. " Frederick Fitzgerald
3. " Edwin Geer .....Post-Wilmington
4. " Thos. H. Haughton .....50th N. C.
5. " Francis W. Hilliard .....Post-Wilmington
6. " Cameron F. MacRae .....15th N. C.
7. " Matthias M. Marshall .....7th N. C.
8. " Joseph W. Murphy .....32d & 43d N. C.
9. " George Patterson .....3d N. C.
10. " Girard W. Phelphs .....17th N. C.
11. " Bennett Smedes .....5th N. C.
12. " John C. Tennant .....32d N. C.
13. " John H. Tillinghast .....44th N. C.
14. " Maurice H. Vaughan .....3d N. C.
15. " Alfred A. Watson .....2d N. C.

Diocese of South Carolina

1. Rev. William P. DuBose .....Kershaw's Brigade

Diocese of Georgia

1. Rev. George Easter
2. " Wm. T. Helms

DIOCESE OF GEORGIA—*Continued*

3. Rev. Telfair Hodgson
4. " Richard Johnson .....1st S. C. Cavalry
5. " Jacquelin M. Meredith
6. " Samuel J. Pinkerton .....Atlanta Hospital

DIOCESE OF FLORIDA

1. Rev. J. J. Scott

DIOCESE OF ALABAMA

1. Rev. J. J. Nicholson .....Post Chaplain

DIOCESE OF MISSISSIPPI

1. Rev. Jno. Chas. Adams, M.D. (?)
2. " Fred W. Damus .....Hospital
3. " M. Elwell
4. " John Gierlow
5. " M. Leander Weller

DIOCESE OF LOUISIANA

1. Rev. B. S. Dunn
2. " Geo.W. Stickney

DIOCESE OF TEXAS

1. Rev. L. H. Jones .....4th Texas Cavl.
2. " H. B. Monges

DIOCESE OF TENNESSEE

1. Rev. Wm. Crane Gray .....4th Tenn.
2. " Chas. Todd Quintard
3. " John Miller Schwrar .....4th Tenn.

IV

THE CHURCH AND THE NEGRO

An interesting field of speculation and conjecture is suggested by the question: What would have been the probable effect upon the institution of slavery, if the Confederate States had become a settled and independent nation? We must, I think, admit that the conditions would have been favorable for its continuance during many years. The whole industrial system of the South was based on slavery, and there were vast unsettled and unimproved regions demanding for their first occupation the kind of labor which slavery most readily supplies. Furthermore, the complete and wide separation between master and slave, not only by race and color, but by intellectual, moral, and social conditions, qualities, and *natural capabilities*, made the problem of emancipation vastly more difficult than had ever been the case in the history of human development in the past. The supreme difficulty was (and it remains the same) that the negro, when freed, cannot be readily and thoroughly taken up and assimilated into the body politic and social. Further, the fact that the incidental cause of the War between the States had been so closely associated with this peculiar institution, though springing ultimately out of divergent theories of constitutional construction, would for

some years have added a strong prejudicial element to the problem of even raising the question as to any kind of dealing with slavery. All these considerations would seem to make it probable that, had the independence of the Confederate States been permanently established, slavery would for many years have remained the peculiar institution of the country, determining the direction of its industrial and commercial development, and modifying its social institutions and its moral and intellectual character.

But, assuming the continued independent existence of the nation, and some, even moderate, degree of prosperity, such as might not unreasonably be looked for, there would have been this great gain for those who may have considered slavery as a present necessary evil, to be remedied in the future: that the people of the South would have been able for themselves to take up the subject, and to give it their serious and intelligent consideration, free from the distracting and exasperating influences of outside interference.

The South had not always been united upon the question. It is well known that her greatest leaders in the first period of independence had been opposed to slavery. Washington and his great contemporaries desired and anticipated its gradual abolition. Many men of that day provided in their wills for the freeing of their slaves; and the very general prevalence of this practice seems only to have been prevented, in Virginia at least, by the manifest disadvantages under which the free colored population of the South lay, and their

apparent inability to make a place for themselves in the progressive life of the community. The three thousand free blacks in Virginia, at the close of the Revolution, had increased, almost entirely by manumissions, to thirteen thousand within the following ten years, and to thirty thousand in the next twenty years. This rapid increase, and the manifest disadvantage, no less to the free negroes themselves than to the whites, of such numbers of free blacks in the midst of a large slave population, caused the enactment of a law that negroes freed after 1806 must leave the State — by no means a harsh measure, or unjust, when we consider the immense extent of unimproved and unoccupied lands in the free States immediately contiguous to Virginia. If the people of those adjoining free States had not met this Virginia law with the most determined efforts to prevent, both by legislative enactment and by lawless violence, the settlement of free negroes among them, Virginia might have been a free State itself before the year 1861.

The most rabid abolitionist of the Garrison school never more passionately protested against slavery, or more vehemently denounced it as unjust and deserving of divine vengeance, than did Thomas Jefferson in his "Notes on Virginia." And in this he but expressed a sentiment common, in varying degrees of intensity, among a very large proportion of the best people of his State, and of other Southern States at that time. In that beautiful sketch of a noble Southern matron by the Rev. Dr. Andrews, the "Life of Mrs. Page,"

is a striking illustration of the state of mind of a large class of the best people of Virginia towards slavery. Mrs. Page was an elder sister of Bishop Meade, and her firm and exalted character was not without influence in the development of the character of her brother. In Mrs. Page's strong feeling of repugnance towards slavery, and in her high-minded determination and firm judicious action to shield the young negro women from some of its greatest dangers, we have a type of the old-time slave-owner by no means exceptional.

By the year 1832 popular feeling in Virginia had become so much aroused upon the evils of slavery, that the most earnest efforts were made in the Legislature of that year to devise some just and practicable means and methods for its abolition. A measure for gradual emancipation failed in one House by only one vote. A majority of the members favored such a policy. One of the most distinguished members of that body, in the course of the great debate on the subject, declared that no avowed advocate of slavery had appeared on that floor to speak for it; and he added, that the day had long gone by "when such an advocate could be listened to with patience or even forbearance."

It is possible that even then the institution had become too thoroughly incorporated with the life of the community to allow of its being removed, except by some such violent and destructive process as that which finally effected its destruction. However that may be, the course of events immediately following

this great effort in Virginia, checked, and then all but reversed, the course of popular feeling on the subject. Many of the best men, however, continued to be of the same mind. Virginia was headquarters of the old Colonization Society, and Bishop Meade was among its ablest advocates and most efficient promoters. He travelled to distant Southern States laboring in this cause. In his early married life he cultivated his fields with the labor of his own hands, and eventually he freed all his slaves. Bishop Atkinson in early life freed all his negroes who were willing to go to the free States, keeping only those who preferred to remain in Virginia as his slaves. It is said that in Virginia alone about one hundred thousand slaves were freed by their owners between the end of the Revolution and the year 1861. It is a strange sight,—and yet characteristic of the man and of his race — to see General Lee, in the midst of his laborious and exhausting duties, and in the intervals between his glorious victories, in the year 1863, taking time to prepare and to execute the necessary deeds for the manumission of the negroes of the Custis estate.

In the same eventful year 1832, at the University of North Carolina, Judge William Gaston, at that time perhaps the foremost citizen of the State, in his notable "Address to the Literary Societies," set before the young men of the University, as one of the imperative duties of the near future, the deliverance of the State from the evil burden of slavery. And it happened, by a strange coincidence, that the oration of the

Valedictorian [1] of the Senior Class at this same Commencement was an argument in favor of the gradual abolition of slavery in North Carolina. These facts are significant of the drift of opinion. The rise about this time of Abolition Societies in the North, and the struggle over the presentation of the Abolition Petitions in Congress, were important influences in bringing about that change of popular sentiment which within a few years made it impossible to discuss, or to consider, the question dispassionately in the South. Had the Confederate States become permanently independent, it would have become possible for the South to reopen the question, and to ask herself what her true interest and her permanent welfare and prosperity did demand of her in settling it.

The Church of Christ should be the conscience of the nation, and in a very real degree it always has been. One of the invariable results of the prevalence of Christianity has been the ultimate disappearance of slavery, in the countries brought under its influence. But it has never sought this end by revolution, nor by imperative canonical action, nor by the direct operation of ecclesiastical censures. It has seemed to treat slavery as an incidental encumbrance, characteristic of certain stages of social progress, to be gradually ameliorated, and so improved out of existence, in the vital processes of moral and social development.

[1] John Haywood Parker, afterwards the beloved rector of St. Luke's Church, Salisbury, N. C.

Perhaps the most familiar instance of this, and the one which comes nearest to us, is seen in the early history of England. Though fortunately not separated by color, race, or essential social characteristics, the early English social order included both bondmen and freemen. And the distinction did not wholly disappear until comparatively modern times. The "*villeins regardant*" and the "*villeins in gross*," of whom we read in our commentaries on the Common Law, were a kind of slaves, whose chains and fetters had for the most part been broken by the time of the Reformation, but who had still some marks of servitude remaining, and some loose links hanging upon them, when Lord Coke published his Commentary on Littleton. And, so far as I recall, the Church of England never proceeded by canonical legislation in her efforts to rescue the slave, and to make him a free man. In fact, in the many broad manors owned by the old monasteries and Prelates of England, thousands of these customary and manorial serfs added to the wealth and power of the Church.[1] But, with whatever of fault or inconsistency, the Church was all the time an influence for human freedom and the emancipation of the slave.

[1] Blackstone has a curious passage in this connection: "For Sir Thomas Smith testifies, that in all his time (and he was Secretary to Edward VI) he never knew any villein in gross throughout the realm; and the few villeins regardant that were then remaining, were such only as belonged to bishops, monasteries, or other ecclesiastical corporations, in the preceding times of popery. For he tells us that 'the holy fathers, monks, and friars had in their confessions, and especially in their extreme and deadly sickness, convinced the laity how danger-

And her influence operated chiefly in two closely related ways: first, she taught, and in some degree enforced in practice, the idea of Christian brotherhood, the oneness of all men in Christ; and second, she introduced certain principles of social order and of Christian duty, especially the sanctity of Marriage and the family relation, and the obligation of personal purity, involving a distinct element of personal freedom. And these two lines of influence, working upon both master and serf, in the end wrought out freedom for both from that institution, which has been a temporary element in the development of almost every people.

The Church in the Confederate States found itself in such a relationship with slavery as perhaps never had existed before. The whole domestic and social life of the country, as well as its agricultural interests, depended upon the service and labor of the slaves; and the clergy were as much involved in the practical workings of the institution as were the laity. By the unfortunate course which the controversy had taken, it had become a point of honor and of patriotism to maintain its utility as well as its lawfulness. To have

ous a practice it was, for one christian man to hold another in bondage; so that temporal men, by little and little, by reason of that terror in their conscience, were glad to manumit all their villeins. But the said holy fathers, with the abbots and priors, did not in like sort by theirs; for they also had a scruple in conscience to impoverish and despoil the Church so much as to manumit such as were bond to their Churches, or to the manors which the Church had gotten; and so kept their villeins still.'"

attacked the institution of slavery, in the prevalent state of public feeling, would have seemed, and in effect would have been, treason to the Southern cause. In the actual state of public affairs, those least desirous of the perpetuation of slavery could not help seeing, that the times were most unsuitable for the discussion or consideration of its continuance.

In this crisis of public interests, and in this temper of the public mind, in the Church and in the nation, it is interesting and gratifying, not to say surprising, to find that, in her first regular synodical gathering, the Church in the Confederate States sounded a clear and strong note of exhortation and of warning, and with instinctive precision touched the two points which from the beginning had been the cardinal points in her work for the elevation of man in his social life — the fact of universal brotherhood in Christ, and the divine character and obligation of the family relationship. The first resolution adopted by the House of Deputies of the General Council of 1862, upon the subject of the Church's work within her own borders, is as follows: "That this Church desires specially to recognize its obligation to provide for the spiritual wants of that class of our brethren, who in the providence of God, have been committed to our sympathy and care by the national institution of slavery." First of all the Church thus recognized the fact of Christian brotherhood in the slave. "*That class of our brethren,*" is the phrase by which she designates him, and declares his *status* in the Church: thus the

House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. The Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops is equally emphatic on the other point. Moreover, the language of the Bishops is remarkable for its suggestion of a future development and a providential work lying before the negroes "*as a people.*" There is some inexactness in the construction of the sentence, but such is my understanding of its meaning. After stating in strong terms the duty of the Church to the slaves, and the impossibility of separating the interests and the fortunes of the two races, it speaks of them as "this sacred trust committed to us, as a people *to be prepared for the work which God may have for them to do in the future.*" The Pastoral Letter then proceeds to urge "upon the masters of the country their obligation, as Christian men, so to arrange this institution as not to necessitate the violation of those sacred relations which God has created, and which man cannot, consistently with Christian duty, annul."

Thus did the Church in the Confederate States, in its very first synodical gathering, set forth these two principles, Christian brotherhood and the divine obligation of the family relationship, out of which have come the regeneration of human society, and the amelioration and gradual elimination of slavery out of the social system.

Not only did the Church in its legislative council thus formally declare itself, but there is no lack of evidence that this synodical utterance expressed what was in the mind and conscience of the people. In

every Diocese of the South, in one form or another, we find evidence of an increasing sense of obligation in respect to the welfare and spiritual enlightenment of the slave. In the Church press appeared long and earnest articles, dealing with his place in the Church, and the adaptation of the Church's methods to his needs, and urging the importance of such modifications in the institution of slavery as Christian people should make, for the elevation of his character and the improvement of his condition. In a series of long and able editorials, continuing through the summer and fall of the year 1861, the *Church Intelligencer* discussed the several aspects of this question: the suitableness of the Church's worship and teaching to the negro; methods of work and instruction, illustrated by notable examples in different parts of the South; and the special obligations arising out of the circumstances of that critical time. In its issue of August 30, 1861, in an article entitled "The Legal Status of Slaves," occurs this passage:

"Men, whose memory runs back thirty years, or a little more, will easily call to mind a state of public feeling then existing such that the great body of our people of all parties, and of all sects, were ready and eager to adopt every safe measure that would tend to ameliorate and elevate the condition of our servile population. Many, no doubt, looked forward to more than this. . . . This hopeful condition of affairs was suddenly changed, and in a few years few persons could be found who thought it expedient and proper to

attempt those alterations which themselves had so recently advocated and so heartily desired. The influence which wrought this great change of public sentiment among us, operated on us almost entirely from abroad. The change of feeling at home sprung from a change of policy elsewhere.

"But this condition of affairs is also now changed. The recent independence of the Southern States has shut out mainly such foreign influence. The system of slavery is now, and is henceforth to be, entirely in our own hands, and under our control, and whatever responsibilities belong to it are ours only. . . .

"Now we have an opportunity, such as in the history of this people has never been. . . . Let then our politicians lay aside their party contests and address themselves to this great work. . . . Let them feel that on them rests a fearful responsibility to man and to God. . . . Let them consult reason, and experience, and most of all the Gospel of Jesus Christ. . . . How far the war under which we are now suffering is the consequence and the penalty of our neglect of duty in this matter, is a grave question." And then, coming to the practical question thus introduced, it proceeds: "Our laws do not recognize the marriage relation among slaves. This omission seems to have been thus far intentional. It is part of the traditional policy of the system. We have adopted it, as the other nations of modern times have done, from the Civil Law. . . . But that such a state of things should exist among us, should have been so

long endured by the Christian consciousness of our people, is a strange thing indeed. . . . We would commend this, and the like evils in the existing condition of affairs, to those who have the rule over us. They deserve deliberate thought and a vigorous effort." Thus, before Bishops or Council had formally spoken, we see the mind and conscience of the Church working

This feeling was general among the best people throughout the South. The Baptist Association of Georgia, in 1864, adopted a resolution setting forth in very strong terms the duty of recognizing, and protecting by legislative enactment, the marriage of slaves, concluding: "that the law of Georgia, in its failure to regulate and protect this relationship between our slaves, is essentially defective and ought to be amended."

The *Southern Presbyterian*, the leading newspaper of that very intelligent and conservative communion, referring with strong approval to the foregoing resolution, says: "This subject is engaging a good deal of attention at the present time. The Christian conscience of the Southern people has been, in some measure, awakened to its importance, and not a few voices are emboldened, even amid all the trials and terrors of the present war, to speak out earnestly the convictions of Christian hearts. We believe that slavery *prevents* more separations of husbands and wives among the blacks, than it *causes*. We believe that there is less conjugal infidelity, fewer conjugal separations, and

more conjugal happiness among them, than there would be if they were free.[1] We believe that when a slave man and a slave woman in good faith take each other to be husband and wife, it is marriage in the sight of God and man, and it does not require the laws of the State to make it so. But our laws wholly ignore that relation among our slaves, and they give the master power to separate the husband and wife, not directly and explicitly, but by the power they give to control the local habitation of the slave. This is what troubles Christian consciences."

The Roman Catholic Bishop of Savannah, much about the same time, gave public expression of his views at some length upon this same question. Among other things he said: "This leads me to another condition on the subject kindred to the preceding. It is that matrimonial relations be observed among slaves, and that the laws of marriage be enforced among them. . . . I leave it to the conscience, reason, and good sense of any upright and virtuous man, whether God can bless a country and a state of things, in which there is a woful disregard of the holy laws of marriage."

Thus we see that, no sooner was the institution of slavery removed from the field of political contention,

[1] This estimate has been fully justified by the experience of the forty-five years of negro freedom since 1865. Separations between husband and wife, with a general disregard of conjugal and parental obligations, have been very greatly more prevalent up to the present time among the negroes, than was ever the case under the system of slavery. Such at least is the opinion of all well-informed persons with whom the writer has conferred on this subject.

than, as a first effect, the public mind and concience began to move along those lines of reform, which suggest, not only immediate improvement in the condition of the slave, but the possibility of his ultimate complete enfranchisement through the normal processes of social development.

He who knows anything of those few crowded and bloody years, when the South, overwhelmed by numbers, exhausted in resources, and drained of her noblest manhood, was making her desperate struggle for national existence, will not be surprised that no great results were accomplished in any work of internal social development. But it may justly be said that the Church, in declaring its principles and in laying out its policy, did what it could, and vindicated its claim to be a living branch of the true Vine; it was like the scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, and, for the necessities of that trying hour, and to meet the demands of the future, it brought forth out of its treasures things new and old.

Although no time was allowed for any change or improvement in the institution of slavery, much work continued to be carried on along the old lines of pastoral ministrations and domestic instructions. The Convention Addresses of Southern Bishops and the meagre parochial reports of the clergy, for many years before the War, abound in references to the work of the clergy and of the masters and mistresses for the slaves. In almost every parish church a certain part of the building was reserved for them, and in many,

special services were arranged for them. In the parish church in which I had the happiness to be brought up the Sunday service in the forenoon was for the white congregation, and the afternoon service was for the colored congregation, quite as numerous as the white. If colored people attended the former service, as they usually did, they had seats in the back of the church: if white people attended the afternoon service, they sat in the gallery. On some of the large plantations churches were built for the negroes, and in many cases, notably, I believe, in South Carolina, special clergymen served these churches. In their private religious instruction Christian parents sometimes taught all the children of the household, white and black, together: [1] in other cases, where, as on plantations, there were many negro children, a Sunday-school for the negro children would be taught at the "great house" or at the "quarters." Catechisms "for those who cannot read" were published with special reference to the instruction of colored people. In the period just preceding the War many of the negroes were coming into the Church. In South Carolina especially the work of the Church among them was extensive and effective. In the report of the Committee on the State of the Church, in the General Convention of 1859, we find this passage relating to South Carolina:

"About fifty chapels, for the benefit of negroes on

[1] The writer was thus taught by his mother every Sunday afternoon,—he and his brother and all the colored children on the place.

plantations, are now in use for the worship of God and the religious instruction of slaves. Many planters employ Missionaries or Catechists for this purpose; many more would do so, if it were possible to procure them. Some of the candidates for Holy Orders are looking forward to this special work. In one parish (All Saints', Waccamaw) are thirteen chapels for negroes, supplied with regular services. The number of negroes attending the services of the Church in this Diocese cannot be shown by statistics; it is very large, and increasing annually."

So successful had this work been in South Carolina that the colored communicants were almost equal to the whites in number; the colored baptisms greatly exceeded the white; the confirmations varied, sometimes greater in number among the whites, sometimes among the negroes. In 1861 the diocesan Journal shows 2979 white communicants and 2973 colored, a difference of only six!

This work in South Carolina suffered very greatly by the War, so much of the seacoast, where the negroes were most numerous and the work of the Church amongst them most extensive, being at an early stage of hostilities occupied by the Federal forces. And it was the same in many other States. But the work did not at all cease or slacken where the Church and its people were free to carry it on. No general statistics have been preserved by which the exact extent and the full fruits of such labors may be known and exhibited; but all through the diocesan Journals, and

Episcopal addresses, and Church papers of those times, are references to the work, and accounts of services, and reports of ministrations, abundantly manifesting the faithfulness of clergy and people in the performance of this part of their duty. In 1862 Bishop Davis reports 633 colored baptisms in the Diocese, and eighty-three confirmations; in May, 1864, for the fifteen months preceding, he reports in his Diocese 1210 colored baptisms and 350 confirmations! This is very much in excess of the work in any other Diocese, and is a noble tribute to the Bishop of South Carolina and his clergy.

The Rev. Alexander Glennie, of All Saints' Parish, Waccamaw, was especially known for his successful work among the negroes of the large plantations of his extensive parish. In January, 1862, he sent to Bishop Atkinson a letter, written at the Bishop's request, describing briefly his methods of work, which the Bishop of North Carolina published, for the encouragement and guidance of his own people engaged in the same kind of effort. Mr. Glennie says that the plantations in his parish extended for thirty miles along the river. He speaks of having at times employed two assistants in the work. With these he had services on eight plantations each Sunday. His method was to train his negroes so that they might enjoy habitually the full service of the Church, teaching them all the responses and Canticles, and also some of the "Selections of Psalms," to be used as a substitute for the Psalms for the day. In preaching, he says, he

broke up his sermon into short sections, and at the end of each section paused, and before going on catechised the adult members of the congregation upon what he had been saying, thus taking them through the whole sermon in this catechetical exercise. The children were catechised on week-days on the plantations, an hour or an hour and a half being given to this work every two weeks on each plantation. To keep the children interested, the work of instruction was enlivened by frequent singing of hymns. The basis of his instruction to the children was the Church Catechism, with questions and answers explaining and illustrating it, by the Rev. Paul Trapier, and questions and answers on the Prayer Book prepared by himself. On some plantations the master and mistress of the family actively engaged in the religious instruction of the negroes, and the good effect of this was always most marked. He speaks of one plantation on which a catechist had been employed since the death of the former owner, who had been very devoted to the work himself. Sometimes the masters and mistresses assumed the responsibility of being godparents for the negro children at their baptism, sometimes the parents and friends of the children.

On the large plantations efforts were made to require the negroes to be regularly married by the clergyman, and to protect them in the married relation; and Mr. Glennie expresses the hope that there may soon be proper legislation to prevent the separation of husband and wife. Chapels had been built on many

of the plantations, some of these being better than many parish churches.

When the negroes resided near enough to attend at the parish church, they received the Communion there, on the regular days of its celebration, with their masters and mistresses and the white congregation; those at a distance attended regular celebrations in the plantation chapels. When he was ordained in 1832, there were ten colored communicants in the parish; there had been added during his ministry 509; the present number was 289. With such work as this going on, it is easy to understand how the numbers of colored communicants in South Carolina, at the beginning of the War, had come to be practically equal to the number of the whites.

And in some measure the same interest and activity in the work appears in almost all the Dioceses. Even in the Empire Diocese of Texas the overworked Missionary Bishop finds time, in the midst of his interminable journeys, to manifest his interest in the negroes; and to his Convention of 1863 he holds up the example of the Primitive Church in its care for the slave, and with much satisfaction calls their attention to the fact that, of the 110 baptisms he reports, thirty were of negro children.

In Mississippi Bishop Green found many of his people in full sympathy with him in his desire and purpose to make the Church a faithful mother to the black people no less than to the white. The situation in 1861 is thus stated in the report of a committee of the

Convention of the Diocese in 1865: "Several of our clergy had become deeply interested in, and were laboring with great success among the servants; quite a number of beautiful chapels had been erected in various parts of the Diocese, for their use by pious masters and mistresses, who either themselves devoted every Lord's Day to their religious instruction, or provided them with the services of a clergyman. There was a growing attachment among them to our mode of worship; the number of communicants was steadily increasing, and it was acknowledged by reflecting men of other communions that the sober services of the Church, and our system of religious instruction, were unquestionably the best adapted to the constitution and condition of this class."

Bishop Green's Journal abounds in such entries as the following: Baptized at Mrs. Ann Barrow's twenty-nine negro children, the mistress standing Godmother for them all. "If there be any 'curse' attendant on slavery, as it exists among us, it is the neglect of masters and mistresses, and the Ministers of Christ, to provide for the spiritual welfare of those whose souls, as well as bodies, are committed to our care;" confirmed seven of Mr. Laughlin's servants at his house, prepared by their mistress; at Mrs. Griffith's baptized four negro children, confirmed five; at Mrs. Mercer's baptized nineteen; ministered to a crowded congregation who joined heartily in the responses. Upon failing to keep an appointment to visit the plantation of Col. George S. Yerger, recently deceased, he writes:

"I could with difficulty shake off the feeling of unfaithfulness," although it was the breaking down of the steamboat which caused him to miss the appointment. And he goes on to express his tender solicitude for "those poor blacks, for whose spiritual welfare he [Colonel Yerger] had labored with more of a father's than a master's care." He held service upon another occasion in the parlor at the house of Mrs. Bailey and confirmed seven of her servants. After the service the negroes who had been confirmed presented the Bishop with a handsome private "Communion set"! To his Convention of 1861 he reports having himself baptized, during the preceding year, nine colored adults and ninety-six infants. And his work among the negroes continued until his Diocese began to be overrun, and his Episcopal labors limited and hindered, by the destructive experiences of hostile invasion.

In Alabama the Committee on the State of the Church in 1863 mention the increased interest of the clergy in work among the negroes, and the report of the Committee urges the clergy to be faithful in pressing upon all masters their religious duty to their slaves. In the Bishop's address in 1864 he mentions confirming on one plantation, Faunsdale, Marengo County, twenty negroes at one service. Bishop Green visited this same plantation in 1862, and mentions the chapel built for the negroes by the owner (Mrs. Harrison, afterwards Mrs. Stickney) as "a finished specimen of Ecclesiastical architecture." Special interest and importance attaches to this work in the Dioceses of

Mississippi and Alabama, because of the comparative weakness of the Church, and the great preponderance of the black people, in those States.

There was little or no difference of opinion among the masters or others, as to the reality and value of this work among the negroes, though so little of it seemed to survive the terrible experience of emancipation, "Reconstruction," and the introduction of the negro of the South as an important political element in our national economy. It was good work which was done among them before and during the War, by godly masters and mistresses and faithful clergymen, judged by the strictest moral and spiritual tests. One of its invariable effects was the creation of a strong sympathetic bond of attachment between master and slave, as illustrated in the following instance. Mr. Josiah Collins, whose sister Mrs. Harrison has been mentioned as the owner of Faunsdale Plantation, in Marengo County, Alabama, and the builder of the beautiful chapel for her slaves, resided upon a large plantation known as "the Lake," on Lake Scuppernong, in Washington County, N. C. Having a large number of slaves, he built upon his plantation a church for his own family and people, and paid the salary of a clergyman who devoted himself to the work as his parish. For years before the War a succession of able and cultivated men ministered to this congregation, maintaining not only the regular Sunday service and the due celebration of all feasts and fasts of the Church, but usually having also a daily service, which was well

attended by those not necessarily engaged in other duties. They also diligently instructed both old and young in Catechism, Bible, and Prayer Book. When the eastern section of the State, including Washington County, had been brought within the power of the Federal forces, and it was no longer possible to prevent the negroes from leaving their owners when they chose to do so, the Collins negroes, following their clergyman,[1] abandoned the plantation, and, transporting their children and their household stuff in the farm wagons, removed several days' journey, a hundred and twenty-five miles inland, to Franklin County, beyond the reach of the Federal forces. Bishop Atkinson, in his Convention Address of 1864, mentions visiting them, and preaching to them under the trees in their new abode, December 18, 1863.

A word should be said of a very faithful class of negroes, those who accompanied their masters to the War. The personal bond between master and servant in this case was peculiarly close, and the latter very often showed an almost maternal care and solicitude in providing for the comfort and welfare of his master. With every opportunity of escaping to the enemy, where freedom was assured, there were very few instances of it. The only one which I know of personally was caused by ill-treatment of the servant during his master's absence. And years afterwards, after the master's death, came a letter from distant Kansas, in which the runaway servant explained to his master

[1] The Rev. George Patterson.

the cause of his desertion, protesting that nothing would have tempted him to leave, if his master had been in the camp at the time to protect him. Some months ago I confirmed an old white-headed colored man in Stokes County, N. C. I was struck with his distinguished manner and venerable appearance. Upon learning his name I found that I had often heard of him from his old mistress, and this is what she had told me. The old man, John Goolsby, was body-servant to her husband, the late Major Peter W. Hairston, during the War. He was very high in his master's confidence, and was well known among his master's friends for his intelligence and integrity of character. Upon one occasion a very distinguished Confederate general, a kinsman of Major Hairston, was in the major's tent, and was interlarding his conversation with violent and profane language, unusual in the army, and all the more remarked upon in this particular general on that account. John was in the tent waiting upon his master and his visitor. Seeming at last to be unable to restrain himself, he interrupted the general's profanity with the freedom which a trusted negro servant would sometimes assume: "Look here, Mar's Jube, I don't *cuss* myself, Sir, and I don't love to hear no body else *cuss*." I confess that I was interested in meeting a colored man who had the force of character to reprove and the grace to do it without offence, where the offender was so much his superior; and I am proud to number him among my flock.

The *Richmond Whig* in March, 1863, contained an affecting story of Mat, the negro servant of Capt. Chalmers Glenn, of North Carolina, who attended his master faithfully during the campaigns of the Army of North Virginia, until Captain Glenn's death upon the battlefield of Boonsboro, or South Mountain. Following the orders he had received from his master, Mat buried him near the place of his death, and returned to his old home and to his widowed mistress, delivering to her the messages and valuables with which his master had intrusted him. But from the day of his master's death Mat visibly declined, and in spite of the best medical attention and the kindest nursing he died of a broken heart, February 4, 1863, surviving his master not quite five months.[1]

Perhaps no better words can be found, with which to conclude this consideration of the Church in its relation to the negro under the old system, than those of the Bishop of North Carolina in 1865, when he set before his people the duties arising out of the new

[1] Clipping from the Charlotte, N. C., *Observer*, April 30, 1911: "Gastonia, April 29. — An unique feature of the annual memorial day celebration here Wednesday, May 10, will be a dinner served by the local Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, to the slaves who went with their masters to the war, or who, remaining behind, did any service for the cause of the South. There are a good many old slaves in the County who come under this head, and this event promises to be one of unusual interest. Congressman E. Y. Webb of this district will be the orator of the day, and special invitations will be mailed within the next day or so to all the Confederate veterans in the County urging them to be present."

relation between the races, created by the results of the war which had just closed.

"I think it right to add a few words on another topic connected with our political condition. It is on our duty to the colored population, lately liberated by the action of the Government of the United States. Some of us have ever feared, that the power and control which the white race possessed over them was not exercised in such a way as to make us acceptable to God, and faithful stewards in His sight. There was much kind feeling towards our servants, which was fully reciprocated by them; there was a good deal of care shown in providing for their bodily wants, but very insufficient attention was paid to their moral and religious improvement. At the same time, I take pleasure in bearing this testimony, which is, I think, very honorable to the masters and mistresses under the old system, that they listened to sharp and pointed rebukes and remonstrances on this subject, not only with patience but with gratitude, that they desired to learn their duty, that they were year by year improving in the discharge of it, that one of the chief cares and labors of a good many men, and of a still larger number of the women, of the South, was the welfare of their servants, and that under the system of slavery in these states the African race has made a progress during the last hundred years, not only in numbers and physical comfort, but a progress from barbarism to civilization, from Heathenism to Christianity, to which the history of the world offers no parallel. . . .

This relation, however, with whatever it had of good, and whatever of evil, being now at an end, but the subjects of it being still in the midst of us, necessarily poor, generally ignorant, and generally improvident, their wants and their dangers must be very great. That, then, which becomes us towards all men, especially becomes us towards them, first to be just, then to be kind. Let us remember then that by our existing political system, in which we have acquiesced, they have a right to wages for their labor. Let us pay these, then, not grudgingly as of necessity, but as an honest debt. . . . As Christians we must see to it that we give them 'that which is just and equal, knowing that we also have a master in heaven.' But we ought to be more than just. That is but the Heathen standard of right. As Christians we must aim at something higher. We must remember their ignorance and inexperience. . . . We must allow for the immediate intoxicating effect of so great and sudden change in their condition. We must keep in mind their general faithfulness in the hour of trial. We must allow for occasional instances of what seems to us folly, or perversity, or ingratitude. We must practise towards them the Apostolical injunctions which are so strikingly enjoined: 'Be pitiful, be courteous.' Their distresses in their new condition are likely to be many and great. Let us be ready to relieve them accordingly as God gives us the means. They are, as a race, peculiarly sensible of courtesy, or the absence of it. They show it abundantly themselves, and they are

very much wounded when it is denied to them. They feel contempt or rudeness more than a serious injury. Let us inflict none of these on them. Let us make them feel what is, I believe, most true, that their best friends are among ourselves, and that to us they must look for counsel, and aid, and protection. But above all, let us remember that part of our duty in which, I fear, we have been most deficient, providing for them sound religious instruction. They are in great danger of falling into the hands of mischievous, and sometimes, no doubt, malevolent, fanatics, which would be a great calamity to them, and also to us. Let us endeavor to avert it, by doing what is at any rate our duty, by giving them the true doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ, in view [qu: lieu?] of the vain janglings of false teachers. Let us raise up colored congregations in our towns, and let all our clergy feel that one important part of their charge is to teach and to befriend the colored people, and especially to train, as far as they are permitted to do so, the children of that race."

V

THE SPIRIT OF THE CHURCH AND ITS BURDENS

It may fairly be claimed for the Church in the Confederate States that the special necessities of the times met a not inadequate response in its work for the soldiers and in its care of the slaves. These practical activities, however, did not by any means engross its attention or absorb all its energies. There appears upon examination abundant evidence of a quite remarkable degree of open-mindedness on the part of the Church, even during these trying times, to entertain new ideas, and of a disposition to set its foot in some new paths of ecclesiastical development, while the din of conflict and the increasing demands of immediate necessity might well have excused indifference to all but the most urgent practical duties. The Church in the Confederate States showed itself to be anything but narrow or provincial in mind and spirit. Within the brief space of four years of strife and confusion, and with only two preliminary conferences and one National Council, it found time to raise, consider, and enter upon, proposals and schemes for advance and improvement, which we have not yet, in the years since the War, been able fully to develop and to accomplish.

We have seen how the question of the name of the

Church was raised in October, 1861, in the adjourned meeting at Columbia, and how three Bishops, and they not the least considerable of that body, had supported the movement, and had voted to substitute "Reformed Catholic" in the place of "Protestant Episcopal." And this was no momentary impulse of thoughtless minds. Bishop Otey and Bishop Atkinson were men of great deliberation of thought and weight of character, who did not speak except upon mature conviction. And in his very brief argument, quoted on a preceding page, the latter had stated, in two or three sentences, the substance of the reasonings which have since been repeated hundreds of times, with scores of variations. Bishop Green was also a man who saw clearly the true position of the Church, and understood the value of right words. He thus refers to this matter in his Address to his Convention of 1862: "I can but deeply regret that, in giving a name to our new organization, one had not been chosen expressive of our Apostolic and Catholic character, in the place of that which seemingly ranks us as one among the many sects of which the last three centuries have been so prolific."

The question as to opening the sessions of the House of Bishops was raised at the General Council of November, 1862, by a motion of Bishop Elliott to admit members of the House of Deputies. Bishop Atkinson objected: in the first place, he said it would be impracticable to admit one class of persons and to prevent the entry of others; but, further, he valued the

privacy of deliberation as tending to lessen heat and acrimony in debate: "In private session many remarks could be passed over in silence, which, if publicly made, must be matter of reply." Bishop Davis said he had at one time great reverence for the House of Bishops; experience had sorely diminished this. "Why attempt to create a fictitious reverence? Let us be real." But he opposed the change, because he thought that the private session lessened the influence of outside popular prejudice upon the Bishops. Bishop Green and Bishop Lay were of the same mind; and Bishop Wilmer suggested the absence of several of the Bishops as an argument against the proposed change; so Bishop Elliott withdrew his resolution. There is no note of this matter in the published minutes of the proceedings of the House of Bishops. The foregoing account is taken from MS. memoranda made at the time by Bishop Lay.

We have seen how the committee, which reported the proposed Constitution, suggested for adoption a scheme of a Provincial System which would have made real Provinces. The modification of that scheme, which was adopted, was as much of an advance towards the Provincial System as the Church in the United States was able to accomplish in the forty years following, up to 1904. The plan of Judicial and Missionary Departments, adopted in 1904, is a slight gain in the direction of eventual Provincial organization.

Bearing on this matter of organization was the canon brought forward in the Alabama Convention

of 1861, the Convention which declared the Diocese of Alabama to be separated from the Church in the United States. This proposed Canon adopted as a principle, and advocated as the true policy of diocesan organization, the primitive idea of the see city, and provided that, as soon as practicable, three sees should be formed out of the Diocese of Alabama, in the cities of Mobile, Montgomery, and Huntsville. The proposed canon was not adopted, but it was characteristic of the times. All through the South there was a disposition to seek for some more effective form of organization than the "State Diocese," and for the first year or two the young Church in the Confederate States heard a great deal of learned talk about the wonderful growth and prosperity to follow upon a reorganization of the Dioceses after a more truly primitive model. The various schemes suggested and discussed all came to nothing in the increasing pressure of deadly peril and necessity, and it is useless to enquire into their details. They do serve, however, to show that the Church was not intellectually stagnant, nor blindly content with its accustomed routine, but was earnestly endeavoring to adapt itself to the varying and urgent needs of the time.

In other directions a beginning was made in important matters, which have since been taken up by the Church in the United States, and carried through to completion. Mention has been made of the Committee, appointed in November, 1862, on the Bible and Prayer

Book. This Committee was made up as follows: Bishops Elliott, Green, and Lay; the Rev. Drs. Sparrow of Virginia, and Mason of North Carolina, the Rev. Paul Trapier of South Carolina, Judge Phelan of Alabama, Judge Battle of North Carolina, and Mr. Edward McCrady of South Carolina. It was charged with the duty of printing the Prayer Book, and preparing a compendium for public worship, taken from the Prayer Book, for the use of the army, as has already been mentioned. But this committee was also authorized to take up the question of Prayer Book revision, and to report to the next meeting of the General Council such changes in the Prayer Book, not affecting doctrine or discipline, as might seem desirable. It had been moved in the House of Deputies that to the words "doctrine and discipline" should be added the word "worship," thus limiting the scope of their work to mere trifling matters of unimportant detail. This amendment, however, had been rejected, and the Committee was left at liberty in regard to all matters purely liturgical; so that they might have considered and reported such a revision as we have since seen actually accomplished in our General Convention of 1892. Such a revision could have been made under the terms of the resolution appointing this Committee. But there was probably no distinct purpose, or even serious thought, of making any important changes at that time. Nothing of the kind was proposed or spoken of, so far as we know, in the Council or in outside discussion. Indeed, the Council

so emphasized the fact that no alterations had been made in the Prayer Book, except the change of two words, and those words such as had no essential doctrinal or liturgical significance, that we cannot avoid the conclusion that any proposition for real revision, however manifestly in the line of improvement, would have been all but unanimously rejected. At the same time the wisdom, which in so many ways shines out in the proceedings of that Council, was not wanting here. The wiser heads in that assembly knew that no forms of worship can for three hundred years express the devotions of a living Church, without, at the end of such a period, requiring some revision, and the admission of new forms and services, for the expression and cultivation of the spiritual life of the people. They therefore wisely introduced, at this critical time, the thought of amendments even to their precious Prayer Book, that, becoming accustomed to the prospect of needed changes, the mind of the Church might be adjusting itself to the thought, and thereby be the better prepared to undertake the work when the fitting season should have come. We have no reason to suppose that the Committee entered upon the serious consideration of any alterations in the Book of Common Prayer.

The only[1] suggestion of any important alteration

[1] In the Convention of the Diocese of South Carolina it was proposed, in 1863, to add the words "*Governor of this State*" after "President of the Confederate States" in the Prayer for those in Civil Authority.

at this time came from the Diocese of Alabama, and is significant of the times. The special trials which Alabama and its Bishop had to endure at the end of the War will be mentioned hereafter. Bishop Wilmer, in his Convention Address of 1864, "with something of prophetic ken," advocated a change in the Prayer for those in Civil Authority. He says: "I have long entertained the opinion, and on suitable occasions have expressed it, that the regular and ordinary forms of public worship should be so entirely catholic in character, as to be adapted to all the exigencies of time, place, and circumstance. It seems to me most undesirable and unnecessary, to say the least, that the Book of Common Prayer should undergo a revision and reprint upon the occasion of every political revolution. The phraseology of the prayer for our Rulers, now in use, has given needless occasion of offence, even in time of high party excitement. The preface to the Book of Common Prayer declares, that, 'in the prayers for our civil rulers, the principal care was, to make them conformable to what ought to be the proper end of all such prayers, namely, that Rulers may have grace, wisdom, and understanding, to execute justice and to maintain truth, and that the people may lead quiet and peaceable lives, in all godliness and honesty,' — a phraseology, in my judgment, at once ample, minute and catholic. If such a form of prayer were introduced into the Service, it would always be appropriate, and we should be spared the necessity of changing our worship with every change in the political

world around us. Should this Council entertain the same opinions with myself, it would be competent for us to instruct our delegates to the next General Council to propose and vote for such a change as I have proposed."

The Diocesan Council of Alabama took up the subject thus suggested by the Bishop, and passed a resolution approving of the proposed change in the prayer; but declared that it was not expedient at that time to instruct their delegates on the subject.

Though no movement was made towards immediate revision of the Prayer Book, the Committee do seem to have considered the revision and improvement of the Hymnody and Psalmody of the Church. We learn from a notice published in *The Church Intelligencer* of October 5, 1864, and signed by the Rev. Thomas F. Davis, Jr., a son of Bishop Davis, probably acting as secretary of the Committee, that Bishop Lay had been requested to make a report to a meeting of the Committee, appointed for December following, on the "Hymnology" of the Church, and that to that end he desired to receive, from all persons interested, suggestions, criticisms, and information, such as might in any manner assist him in the proper fulfilment of the duty assigned to him. From the same source we learn also that Bishop Green was chairman of a like "sub-committee having charge of our peculiar Psalmology," and that he was desirous of obtaining, for the use of his sub-committee, copies of "paraphrases and metrical versions of the Psalms, specially those of

Chas. Wesley, Lyte, Bishop Mant, and Archdeacon Churton."

In the event it proved that no sufficient time or leisure was allowed for the development and accomplishment of those schemes for improving the worship of the Church, or for its better adaptation to changing conditions and necessities. But it is interesting to observe how, in several matters, and those of no slight moment, these schemes and efforts anticipated the action of the reunited Church in the years which have elapsed since the close of the War. And perhaps they are even more interesting and important as showing how the Church in the South kept a true sense of proportion in her life and work, and was by divine grace enabled to preserve the spirit of love and devotion. The din of war did not dull her ears to the heavenly harmonies of prayer and praise. It is a noble sight to look upon — Bishop Green, with his Diocese desolated by war, overrun by contending armies, and his own delicate frame taxed beyond endurance by incessant pastoral labors; and Bishop Lay, driven from his Diocese, and once and again arrested and imprisoned, not even upon a false charge, but confessedly upon no charge at all of misdoing, but simply as means of terrifying others, — to see these two saintly men, amid these sad and distracting surroundings, setting themselves to study with renewed care and diligence the Psalms of David and the great hymns of the Christian Church, that thereby they might help God's people to a nearer sense of His presence and

power, and a deeper trust in His love and goodness. It is like Paul and Silas praying and singing praises to God out of the darkness of their Philippian prison!

But the work of Bishops and of Councils, and even the faithful ministrations of the Church to the soldiers, and its anxious care and labor for the spiritual welfare of the slaves, were only a small part of its life and work during those four years of heroic struggle. The greatest and best things in life can never be adequately preserved and portrayed. They can only be experienced and, perhaps, remembered. The burden and difficulty of maintaining the ordinary routine work of the Church in the South were greatly increased, and too often that work was wholly destroyed in its visible aspect, by the War. In the first months of the opening conflict the violence of political and sectional feeling, and the fierceness of the martial spirit, produced a state of popular feeling adverse to religious sentiment and unresponsive to religious appeals. The urgency of the temporal necessity, and the appeal to physical force, weakened the moral sense and dulled the apprehension of spiritual truth. Bishop Gregg, in his Pastoral Letter of December 27, 1861, thus refers to the secularizing influence of absorbing political interests: "Things present and things to come are equally unavailing to stem the tide. The Christian's heart is taken captive, his love for Christ grows cold, prayer dies away, religious zeal abates, spiritual realities cease to affect him, and lukewarm-

ness is the present effect, as spiritual death may be the final result." Bishop Otey's words of like import have already been quoted.

This condition of the public mind, however, soon passed away with the increasing experience of the tremendous character of the conflict, and of its demands upon the courage and patience of the people. The ministrations of the Church, when the South had settled down to the real strain of the struggle, were more effective and more fully appreciated than ever before. For example, we read in a news-item in the *Church Intelligencer* of September 14, 1864, referring to the Journal of the Diocesan Convention of Georgia: "Under the blessing of God the progress of the Church has been wonderful, *and the liberality of the people* without stint. In the Bishop's visitations every where he seems to have been received into communities where the Church is hardly known, with open arms. Places suitable for service were provided, children and adults baptized, and numbers confirmed. But a few years ago, Georgia seemed a cold and barren soil for the plantation and growth of the Church. Now it appears that the seed sown after all was not on unpropitious soil." While in many sections the ministrations of the Church were thus increasingly effective, large areas of country and large numbers of the population came, in one way and another, as the War went on, to be cut off and rendered inaccessible. The occupation of parts of the country by hostile forces, the passing and repassing of contending armies, the

absence of almost the entire white male population in the army, and the consequent removal of their families from such regions as were exposed to the occupation, or the devastating raids of the enemy, so depopulated the country, or so weakened and demoralized its diminished population, that parishes were broken up, the clergy left without support, and the ministrations of the Church in too many cases wholly abandoned. Often the clergyman, whose flock was thus scattered and his work destroyed, had an unprotected family, whom he could not leave, to take a chaplaincy in the army at a stipend insufficient even for his own expenses, nor, in the general interruption of communications, could he find another parish, in the impoverished condition of the country, able to afford a refuge and maintenance for his wife and children. Bishop Davis refers to such conditions as existing to a considerable extent in the rich and populous coast counties of his Diocese, where the Church had been strongest and most amply supplied, but which now were either occupied by the enemy, or exposed to constant apprehensions of danger, from the fleets of the United States, never long absent from that coast. Bishop Green says in his Convention Address of 1863, before Mississippi had come to its worst experiences of war, that of his thirty-seven clergymen "not more than two thirds of them are actively and efficiently engaged in parochial labor."

Where these unfavorable conditions did not prevail, those clergymen who were not possessed of some private fortune began, after the first year of the War,

to endure a heavy burden of anxiety and of difficulty in providing even the most meagre support for their families. The cost of living went up so rapidly, by the double influence of a diminishing supply and a depreciating currency, that the most ample salary, promised at the beginning of the year, proved wholly insufficient long before it had been paid. It is a curious experience, of all such times of financial disorder and a fluctuating currency, that men's ideas have become so fixed upon names and the mere denominations of money, that it is difficult for them to remember, so as truly to realize, the fact that money is merely a medium of exchange, and has a relative value only — is worth only what it will purchase. A dollar somehow seems really to be a dollar, and to have an intrinsic worth, when it has long ceased to command in exchange that which gave it value. In the worst times of depreciated Confederate money five thousand dollars, to the mind of the man not in business and not accustomed to frequent financial transaction, seemed a very large salary; so large in fact that very few clergymen, except those having the chief parishes in the very few large Southern cities, ever received so much; yet that sum, after the first two years of the War, was wholly inadequate for the most frugal support of the average family. Even a rich congregation could with difficulty keep the salary of the rector up to his living expenses, for it was impossible to estimate expenses even three months ahead. Happy was that rector who had among his parishioners prosperous

planters and farmers who could make their contributions towards his support in corn and wood, pork and potatoes.

In September, 1864, the Richmond *Sentinel*, in a striking editorial article, propounded the question: "*How can Pastors live?*" It then proceeded to give some figures in elucidation of the question it had raised, taking as a basis for calculation a family of six persons, man and wife, two children, and two servants; and allowing the meagre half-ration served out to the Confederate soldier as the measure of the necessary food supply. This is the calculation given:

400 lbs. bacon	at $	5	$2000
4 bbls. flour	"	150	600
20 bush. corn meal	"	20	400
32 loads of wood	"	25	800
20 lbs. lard	"	5	100
10 lbs. tallow, for lights	"	5	50
6 pairs of shoes			350
House Rent			400
Hire of two servants			250
Taxes, and Salt — say —			50
			5000

The writer states that the prices given above are lower than the prices then prevailing in some parts of the country; and it will be noticed that nothing is allowed for milk, butter, eggs, sugar, molasses, fresh meats, vegetables, fruit, or poultry; and that one pair of shoes for each member of the family is all that this estimate allows in the way of clothing. The editor very pertinently proceeds: "Can any reasonable man

think such a question out of place in a secular journal? No men render the country more important service at all times; and during this fearful struggle, who have so powerfully upheld everything that was good? How unrequited their services have commonly been, is better known than practically regarded. Does it not, then, become every good patriot — saying nothing of the Christian — to take up this question now in its proper bearing, — 'How can your Pastor live?'"

As one answer to his question the editor states that the members of the Second Presbyterian Church, of Richmond, had just presented to their pastor, the eminent and beloved Dr. Moses D. Hoge, the sum of twelve thousand dollars in addition to his regular salary. We learn from another source that, much about this same time, "certain laymen of the Diocese of South Carolina have presented Bishop Davis with a purse of *ten thousand dollars*, to provide better for his comfort in these times of cheap money and dear living." The Diocesan Convention of Alabama, this same year 1864, passed a resolution: "That in consideration of the advanced prices of living, the parishes be invited to make voluntary contributions to the support of the Bishop, and forward the same to him, when practicable, in such manner as they shall deem most expedient." The want and suffering which must have been endured by many of the clergy and their families in small and obscure parishes could hardly be more forcibly suggested to the judicious mind than by these extraordinary methods adopted

in the case of those most favorably situated and least exposed to want.[1]

Upon his Diocesan Convention of May 5, 1864, the Bishop of Alabama urged the imperative duty of establishing Homes for the widows and orphaned children of the State. The Convention endorsed the suggestion, and requested the Bishop to take upon himself the authority of establishing such Homes. It was proposed to have, not one great institution, but a number of small Homes in different parts of the Diocese. In *The Church Intelligencer* of December 7, 1864, Bishop Wilmer published a statement of his plans and purposes, and claimed the support of his people. The Diocese of Alabama through its Bishop had established an order of Deaconesses under whom this extensive work was to be carried on. These good women, devoting themselves to works of piety and charity, were divided into three classes, Deaconesses and Associates, who were to reside in one or other of the permanent Chapter Houses, and Probationers, who were not required to do so. They were all to serve without fee or reward, receiving only their necessary support from the order, and anything given them was to go into a common fund. "From these

[1] Bishop Gregg, in his Convention Address in 1864, expresses his gratitude to his people for voluntary contributions made to his support in addition to his salary.

The following entry is copied from Bishop Lay's MS. Journal:

"Arkadelphia, Arkansas, May 3, 1863.

"Preached on the text, '*Is it a time to receive money?*' A pair of boots, a barrel of sugar, and $290 given me here."

several classes persons will be detailed to act as matrons and assistants in Church Homes; as nurses in Hospitals; as teachers; and to serve in any capacity or place, where it may be thought advisable or necessary." This very extensive and admirable scheme was carried out only partially. The collapse of 1865 checked it almost in its birth; but the order of Deaconesses remains one of the institutions of the Diocese.

The trials of those days were not without blessed results in the lives of both clergy and people, "who were exercised thereby." Common struggle, common suffering, and common poverty bore sweet fruits of mutual sympathy, helpfulness, and love; and never was there a fuller and freer hospitality, a more generous response to the necessity of friend and neighbor, and of the stranger, especially if he were a soldier, whom chance or the fortune of war brought to the door. *The traditions of the War are cherished in the South, not merely in honor of our noble dead, but because of their many precious and helpful memories of mutual kindness, sympathy, and affection, growing out of the common trials and tribulations of those strenuous days. There was war without, but there was peace and good-will within our borders.*

And there was no secularizing of the Church or of the clergy. It is true that a few clergymen entered the army, as Bishop Polk, and the Rev. William N. Pendleton, who served with distinction as colonel, and chief of artillery, and rose to the rank of brigadier general. But the common mind and heart of the Church were not affected by these exceptional cases.

Bishop Polk's known deeply religious character, his high-minded yet simple-hearted devotion and spirituality, manifest to all who came in contact with him, the burden which lay upon his heart, and his undoubted sincerity in desiring to be released from the obligations of military service, seemed to set his case apart, and to emphasize its wholly exceptional character. And there were not wanting those who, seeing the wonderful religious influence exerted by him in the army, and especially among the highest officers who were in any way associated with him, felt that his military service had been providentially blessed, and used in the work of extending the Kingdom of Christ.

The clergy throughout the South were enthusiastically loyal to the cause of the Confederacy, and none more so than those who had come from the North, as many of our most distinguished clergymen had come. But, though loyal in heart and mind to the Southern cause, they were seldom guilty of forgetting their duty as ministers of Christ. *They stood in their place;* they ministered about holy things; and they realized their function in binding up the wounds and allaying the fever of strife. The note sounded out in the heated days of 1861, that political preaching must be eschewed, and that the clergy must give a spiritual application to secular events, and so keep themselves within their proper sphere — that continued to be the note which the Church gave out through all the long months and years of strife. Thus in May, 1863, the Committee on the State of the Church in the Virginia Diocesan

Council: "To our ministers, especially in this crisis, we would say — What is wanted is not sermons on the times and the war and the objects of our country's hopes. We need not preach to the soldiers about war and camp and battles; they hear and think enough of that without our help. What they want and expect of us as ministers of Christ, is just the glad tidings of salvation, just the eternal message of grace and love to perishing sinners." Those whose memory retains the impression made by the pastoral ministrations of those days can never forget with what power the appeal of the Gospel message, in the ordinary services of the Church, was emphasized by the great experiences, the victories, the defeats, the sufferings and bereavements, of the time. In all the special prayers put forth by the Bishops there was a note of humility and penitence. I do not remember a phrase of offensive hostility in reference to the public enemy, more than a petition that the plans of the invader might be confounded, and that he might be repelled from our borders, or some equivalent expression. And what a solemn warning the words of the old prophet seemed to have for us in the fast-day text of the preacher, when he spoke to us from these, or such like, words: "For all this His anger is not turned away, but His hand is stretched out still!"

The Southern Bishops, in their Pastorals and Convention addresses, did not fail to warn their people against the temptation to entertain feelings of malice and hatred against the enemies and invaders of their

country. The Bishop of Mississippi was a man of tender sensibilities, and of an emotional temperament, whose feelings were not kept under restraint by that massive and masterful quality of character, which in such a man as Bishop Atkinson, for example, seemed to make any ebullition of feeling or of temper all but impossible to imagine. And Bishop Green's Convention addresses show many evidences of the keenness of the pain he endured in speaking of the experiences of his pastoral work. It is, on that account, all the more impressive to read his words to his Convention of 1861: "Let us not, in the fervor of our patriotism, forget that we are Christian men, and yield to feelings of hatred and revenge, more than a true love of country calls for at our hands. . . . Dreadful as is the spirit of this unnatural struggle, it may yet be driven out by prayer and fasting. . . . Let us suppress all bitterness and wrath towards others, and all envyings and jealousies among ourselves." And again in 1863, after a pathetic account of the ruin, desolation, spoliation, and destitution of the people, with the frustration of all good works, in certain parts of his Diocese, he hastens to add: "Let us also take heed, beloved brethren, how we suffer these unjustifiable acts of our enemy to betray us into a spirit of revenge and indiscriminate reprobation of a people so lately united to us in fraternal bonds, and among whom there are at this moment no doubt thousands who feel for us a sympathy they dare not express." Another interesting passage in Bishop Green's Lenten Pastoral, dated February 22,

1862, anticipates the comparatively recent recommendation of one of our Missionary Councils in regard to the general observance of the noontide prayer. He says: "Let each minister of God open his church daily, and use the Litany, together with such of our Collects and Prayers as our most pressing wants require. And let those who may be providentially hindered from thus making their common supplications before God, seek Him in the retired chambers of their dwellings. And, that our petitions may go up *unitedly* before Him, let me further recommend that the HOUR OF TWELVE each day be observed for that purpose, until Peace be restored to our borders. When God shall thus see a people on their knees, He will not be long in hearing their cry."

Little as our people in general may have been able to attain to this benign and patient spirit, in the fierce hurry and strain of the deepening conflict, they were proud of their saintly Bishops, and loved and respected them all the more, because they thus warned them, and set before them their sins.

Not that the Southern Bishops and clergy, more than other men, were perfect, or wholly superior to the human feelings naturally engendered by the experiences through which they were passing. Now and again natural feeling breaks out, and sectional or party prejudice may color a sermon or a prayer. The eloquent Bishop of Georgia was at times moved to set before his people the grounds upon which the South had separated from the North; or in his pathetic and

indignant outburst of feeling, in his funeral oration over the dead body of his friend and brother, the Bishop of Louisiana, he might seem to forget the self-restraint of the Christian philosopher in the fiery ardor of the patriot and the loving sorrow of the friend; as did others of lesser note upon less provocation. But such cases were exceptional, and served but to emphasize the general tone of humility, reverence, and godly sincerity, in which the clergy of the Church called upon their people to repent of their sins, both personal and public, and to see in the sufferings and bereavements of the hour wholesome disciplines and corrections for their profit, and for the ultimate good of their country.

It must not be supposed, however, that the Church or the clergy pleased themselves with any complacent dreams of their own goodness. The deep sense of unworthiness, characteristic of the religious feeling of the time, is the chief evidence of a real power working in the mind and heart; and both in sermons and in the religious press are found constant warnings against the dangers and increasing evils of the hour. But it is noticeable that while vice and intemperance and profanity and malice are rebuked, there is no assertion, or other evidence, that these sins were increasing. On the contrary, from time to time appear evidences and testimonies, both direct and incidental, that in those particulars there was a manifest improvement general throughout the country, and especially among the soldiers. The sins complained of, and the chief

objects of attack by preachers and religious writers, were the sins of greed, covetousness, extortion, and disregard of the sanctity of the Lord's Day. In the last case the complaint was mainly directed against the Confederate government for violating the Sunday rest in connection with the public business. Bishops preached against speculation in the necessaries of life, against extortion, and against the inordinate thirst for riches, manifest in such practices. Certainly such sins needed to be preached against; yet it is quite certain also that it was the unavoidable conditions of war, and scarcity, and a depreciating currency, which were the real evils. The apparent increase in the practices complained of was an unavoidable incident of those conditions, and did not indicate moral deterioration in the people.

Beyond all question there was a distinct and general development of religious feeling and principle produced in the South by the War.[1] Its leaders, both civil and military, were, as a rule, distinctly religious men. We have seen something of this in connection with the work of the Church in the army. The same was, in a measure, the case among the statesmen of

[1] Bishop Gregg, whose striking testimony upon the demoralizing influence of the War spirit in 1861 is quoted on a former page, remarks later upon the opposite effects upon the public mind as the struggle continued. In his Convention Address in 1864 he says: "The course of events during the war, with its impressive teachings, has deeply affected the hearts of the great mass of our people. . . . The greater number have been taught by His providential dealings, or by His chastenings, to recognize, and think more devoutly, of Him Who ruleth over all."

the Confederacy. The trials, vicissitudes, burdens, and bereavements of a war, in which all material forces were against us, served to bring the personal qualities of the leading men into greater prominence. The formal utterances of state papers and proclamations took a tone of reality, and touched a chord of responsive sentiment, in the strain of a life and death struggle against overwhelming odds, such as cannot be known in times of lesser stress. The word passed from mouth to mouth, in a country so closely knit together in personal knowledge and association as was the South in those days, that such a Colonel, eminent for his courage and achievements, had a few Sundays before been baptized in front of his regiment; and the story brought home, by the soldier on furlough, of the piety of his General, — these things powerfully affected the public sentiment of a people, who began to see little hope of success in mere material forces. They saw in these things the presence of a higher power. We read in the Convention address of a Southern Bishop in 1863: "I cannot refrain from expressing my thankfulness to Almighty God, the Ruler of Nations, for having raised up for us in the hour of our need a Chief Magistrate as manly in piety as he is sage in council and valorous in arms. Among the many omens which have cheered our people in their unequal struggle, none has so affected the heart of your Bishop as the intelligence that our worthy President had openly professed his faith in Christ, and laid himself with all his honors at His feet." This refers, of course,

to the confirmation of President Davis in St. Paul's Church, Richmond. The consistent purity and high-minded integrity of Mr. Davis's whole life made this simple act of Christian duty on his part a powerful testimony to the people over whom he had been called to preside. It had been remarked that he closed his Inaugural Address with a simple and devout appeal to the Heavenly Father: "To Thee, O God, I trustfully commit myself, and prayerfully invoke Thy blessing on my country and its cause." An illustration of this same spirit may be given, taken from later and darker days. In appointing November 16, 1864, as a day of public worship and supplication, he invites "The people of these Confederate States to assemble in their respective places of public worship, there to unite in prayer to our Heavenly Father, that He bestow His favor upon us; that He extend over us the protection of His almighty arm; that He sanctify His chastisement to our improvement, so that we may turn away from evil paths, and walk righteously in His sight; and that He may restore peace to our beloved country, healing its bleeding wounds, and securing to us the continued enjoyment of our own right of self-government and independence; and that He will graciously hearken to us, while we ascribe to Him the power and glory of our deliverance."

Churchmen in the South, with the people in general, felt much satisfaction in the formal recognition of the Person and government of God, contained in the Constitution of the Confederate States; and held it to be

one of the very great improvements in that document, as compared with the Constitution of the United States. Unquestionably there was an increased thought of, and trust in, the divine power, as all other sources of help seemed cut off. Thus were our people providentially strengthened in faith and patience, that they might bear the greater loads of sorrow and suffering which the future held in store.

One of the greatest difficulties encountered by the Confederate government was in providing for the proper care of the sick and wounded soldiers. Proper provision, in any adequate sense, the government was never able to make; and in the first stages of the conflict it might almost be said that no provision at all, in many cases, could be made by the public authorities. Private beneficence came to the aid of the destitute medical department, and all during the war individual charity did what it could to supply the deficiencies of the service, and to supplement official care. In the language of a distinguished officer from the Carolinas, who served throughout the war in Lee's army, "Every house in Virginia was a hospital," so unstinted was the response of the people to the demands made by the necessities of the suffering soldiers. In the Church papers of the day are appeals from the surgeons of the army to the people for contributions from their scanty and fast-diminishing household stores, to supply the hastily extemporized hospitals with such necessary articles and remedies as they might possess; and seldom were such appeals unheeded.

As an illustration of the methods of those days, the case of the sick and wounded soldiers, captured at Newbern in the spring of 1862, may be mentioned. The Federal commander, shortly after taking possession of Newbern, put the sick and wounded Confederate soldiers, whom he found in the hospital, on a steamboat, and sent them around by the Pamlico river to Washington, N. C., and so up the river to Tarborough, and delivered them under parole to the Confederate authorities. With them were a Confederate surgeon, and a distinguished physician of Tarborough,[1] who had volunteered his services in the Newbern hospital. There was in Tarborough no hospital building; there were no hospital stores, medicines, surgical appliances, or provisions of any kind for the reception and care of the sick and wounded, more than could be found in any other small country town of that day in the South. In this emergency a large academy building was taken for a hospital, and one soldier patient was assigned to each family in the town, or, in the case of a few of the more opulent, two patients to a family. The family, to whom the patient was assigned, undertook to supply him with such things as he needed, bedding, clothing, and food prepared and sent to the hospital three times daily, under the direction of the surgeons in charge. Thus the immediate necessity was met, and the hospital supplied, after a fashion.

In this work of caring for the sick and wounded the Church found an unlimited and increasing demand

[1] Surgeon Wm. A. Blount and the late Dr. N. J. Pittman.

upon the hearts and hands of its clergy and people. No reckoning can ever be made in this world of the blessed work of noble women and pious laymen in this field. In the region of actual hostilities, personal service among the wounded and dying in the hospitals formed a large part of the regular pastoral work of the clergy. In places distant from field and hospital, the people organized for systematic contributions of money and supplies. As early as August, 1861, the Bishop of Georgia issued a Pastoral to his Diocese, foreseeing the necessity, and urging the formation, in every parish, of an organization to work systematically for a supply of clothing for the soldiers; to prepare hospital supplies, such as bandages, lint, and the like, to be laid up against the time of need; to raise money to purchase medicines; and to secure fit persons to volunteer as nurses in the hospitals. The clergyman of each parish was requested to assume the direction of this work, selecting a suitable layman of the parish to serve as secretary and treasurer of the local organization. We do not know to what extent this was carried into effect.

In the spring of 1862 the Rev. Benjamin M. Miller, of Natchez, resigned his parish, and organized the "Female Hospital Aid Society," to work under his direction in the hospitals. "They expect to go to the hospitals *nearest* the army, so as to be ready, in case of a battle, to minister, as far as they can, to those who may require such aid." A few weeks later we read in Bishop Green's Convention address of 1862: "Rev. Benjamin M. Miller is, for the present, engaged in the praise-

worthy occupation of succoring our wounded soldiers. Attended by a faithful, self-denying band of Sisters-in-Christ, he is ministering to both the bodily and spiritual needs of these brave men who lately suffered for us on the field of Shiloh."

In 1863 we find Bishop Lay recording in his private journal, how in Little Rock he met the ladies (probably of the community in general), and organized them, fifty-five in number, into four committees, each under its proper leader, for service in the four hospitals in Little Rock, which then contained four hundred and fifty patients. He mentions the distribution by these ladies of five hundred "bed comforts" to the patients in these hospitals. A few days later he notes the fact that the church had been dismantled, and given up for a hospital, and says that he had given all his "carpets to cover the sick." In the absence of a sufficient supply of blankets, woollen carpets were often cut up to make coverings for the soldiers, in the field as well as in the hospitals.

And among the heavy burdens of those days not the least was the thought of sons and husbands and fathers, and brothers and friends, languishing in distant prisons, at Point Lookout, at Johnson's Island, and the other military prisons of the North. The petition in the Litany, for "*all prisoners and captives*," came then to have its first real meaning for many worshippers in the Church service. The policy of the Federal government refused all exchange of prisoners for long periods, and thereby deliberately subjected their own

soldiers, held prisoners in the South, to those conditions of want and suffering and disease, which the Confederate authorities were absolutely helpless to prevent. And, as bearing upon the condition and treatment of prisoners of War in the North and in the South, it should be remembered that statistics, published by the government since the War, show that the percentage of mortality was very much greater among the Southern prisoners in the North than among the Northern prisoners in the South. Among the special prayers put forth during the War, not the least impressive and affecting is one by the Bishop of North Carolina: "*For our Soldiers now held Prisoners by the Enemy.*"

A correspondent of *The Church Intelligencer*, from Danville, Va., in January, 1864, gives an interesting account of a service held in the Danville hospital for Federal prisoners, filled with the sick and wounded, by two Confederate chaplains, the Rev. James Carmichael and the Rev. Alfred M. Randolph, now Bishop of Southern Virginia. The service was attended also by citizens of Danville, and by some Confederate soldiers. The writer says: "A cloud of dark blue extending down the ward. . . . A few of our soldiers entered the room, and quietly took their seats, the Federals making room for them, dotting the dark blue here and there with gray. Together we sang and knelt and prayed, friend and foe, refugee and prisoner, . . . and heard the love and liberty of the Gospel proclaimed. In front of me sat a Federal bathed in tears;

behind me sat a Confederate similarly affected; thoughts of the past and of the present rushed over me in overwhelming tide. God grant that such scenes may dispose us to an honorable and peaceful separation."

The following lines, appearing in the newspapers of that day, and signed with the pen-name, *Personne*, of a distinguished correspondent[1] of the Charleston press, have at least one element of true poetry; they speak out of the very heart of those days, and of their deepest experiences.

A CALL TO THE HOSPITAL

Fold away all your bright-tinted dresses,
Turn the key on your jewels today,
And the wealth of your tendril-like tresses
Braid back in a serious way;
No more delicate gloves, no more laces,
No more trifling in boudoir or bower,
But come, with your souls in your faces,
To meet the stern wants of the hour.

Look around. By the torch light unsteady
The dead and the dying seem one.
What! trembling and paling already,
Before your dear mission's begun?
These wounds are more precious than ghastly;
Time presses her lips to each scar,
While she chants of the glory which vastly
Transcends all the horrors of war.

Pause here by this bed-side. How mellow
The light showers down on that brow!
Such a brave, brawny visage! Poor fellow!
Some homestead is missing him now:

[1] F. G. DeFontaine.

Some wife shades her eyes in the clearing;
Some mother sits moaning, distressed;
While the loved one lies, faint but unfearing,
With the enemy's ball in his breast.

. . . . .

Pass on; it is useless to linger,
While others are claiming your care.
There is need for your delicate finger,
For your womanly sympathy, there;
There are sick ones athirst for caressing,
There are dying ones raving of home,
There are wounds to be bound with a blessing,
And shrouds to make ready for some.

They have gathered about you the harvest
Of death in its ghastliest view;
The nearest as well as the farthest,
Is here, with the traitor and true.
And crowned with your beautiful patience,
Made sunny with love at the heart,
You must balsam the wounds of a nation,
Nor falter nor shrink from your part.

Up and down through the wards, where the fever
Stalks noisome, and gaunt, and impure,
You must go with your steadfast endeavor
To comfort, to counsel, to cure.
I grant that the task's superhuman,
But strength will be given to you
To do for these dear ones what woman
Alone in her pity can do.

And the lips of the mothers will bless you,
As angels sweet-visaged and pale!
And the little ones run to caress you,
And the wives and sisters cry, "Hail!"
But e'en if you drop down unheeded;
What matter? God's ways are the best.
You have poured out your life where 'twas needed,
And He will take care of the rest.

VI

SOME OF THE TRIALS AND TRIBULATIONS OF THE TIMES. BISHOP WILMER'S TROUBLES IN 1865

In his Convention address in 1861, the Bishop of Mississippi thus sets forth his conception of the relationship between Churchmen North and South, and the brotherly spirit which they would preserve, even amid civil and political dissensions: "But whilst the State is thus passing through the fires of a painful revolution, how thankful should we be that the Church is at peace, and that though our political relations toward our brethren, with whom we have hitherto so lovingly associated, have been severed, no change of name, of government, or national interest, will be able to lessen our affection for them as fellow members of the One Holy and Apostolic Communion which is in Christ our Lord. If a separate and independent ecclesiastical organization shall be demanded by the change in our political relations, it will exhibit to the world a division without dissension, a separation without injury to the respective parts, a parting of brothers amid tears of affection, and with mutual commending of each other to God. In what a beautiful light will such action exhibit the Catholic spirit of the Church! Unmoved by the changes and chances of the political world, she pursues the even tenor of her way, holding

forth to every age and nation the bread of God, untainted by the leaven of party strife, and rich in all the blessings of a purchased salvation."

Similar expressions may be found in the recorded utterances of other Bishops, and of Diocesan Conventions in the South, in the opening days of the struggle. So satisfied were both clergy and people of the permanent character of the political separation between the sections, and of the necessity of a separate organization for the Church, as a consequence of political independence, that it did not occur to them that others could take a different view; and they seem to have felt quite sure that amid all civil and political trials the Church would manifest only the benign spirit of the Gospel, and the unbroken charity of Christian brethren.

These pleasing anticipations were not fulfilled in the experience of the years immediately following. And yet they had some justification in the real character and heart of our Churchmen, North and South, and in the true principles of the Church; and when the clouds of war began to lighten and roll away, and the blinding influences of the contest, with its heat and passion, began to abate, the Church of our love, first of all the great institutions of the reunited country, showed forth the spirit of Christian forbearance, mutual compliance, and godly union and concord.

And in order that we may have some faint conception of the difficulties of the situation, and of the wonderful development of self-conquest, patience, and

magnanimity involved in the prompt reunion of the separated parts so soon after the close of war, it is necessary to refer briefly to some of the painful occurrences of the preceding years, and to some of the difficult questions raised by the events of that time.

The fact that in our prescribed formularies of public worship there is distinct mention made of both the executive and the legislative departments of the government, exposed the clergy of the Church to peculiar embarrassment, whenever any part of the territory of the Confederate States was occupied by the Federal forces. So far as appears, other Christian ministers were, as a rule, not interfered with, unless by some intemperate word or action they specially invited the attention of the Federal authorities. But the most cautious and prudent conduct did not secure the clergy of the Church from hostile animadversion; and in many cases they were treated with great injustice, cruelty, and outrage. For in their Sunday ministrations their sense of allegiance to their Diocese and Bishop, as well as to the Church in the Confederate States, laid upon them the duty of praying for the President of the Confederate States. In some cases they felt justified in omitting altogether the prayer for those in civil authority. In very few cases did they feel that they could use the prayer for the President or the Congress of the United States. To the credit of many of the officers of the United States army, occupying Southern towns and cities, they seemed anxious to avoid, as far as possible, any interference with the religious worship

of the people; and where these prayers were passed over they did not concern themselves with the matter. Indeed there are instances in which they seem to have been anxious that the clergy should not be disturbed in their work, and to that end gave assurance that they should not be molested, or any way hindered, so long as all political questions were avoided. When in the spring of 1862 Newbern was occupied by the United States forces, the Rev. Wm. R. Wetmore, assistant to the Rev. Dr. Watson, was in charge of the church, the rector having become a chaplain in the Confederate army. In the address of Bishop Atkinson to the Convention of 1862, and in the report of the Rev. Dr. Watson to the same Convention, it is stated that the Rev. Mr. Wetmore had not been allowed to continue his ministrations, because he would not promise to use the prayer for the President of the United States. This, however, proved to be erroneous. When Mr. Wetmore was able to leave Newbern, and to come within the Confederate lines, he published a statement to the effect that the Bishop and Dr. Watson had been misinformed, and that the Federal authorities had proposed to him that he should continue his ministrations in the church, and simply omit the prayer for those in civil authority. A letter from New Orleans in February, 1863, mentions that St. Luke's Church had been reopened, and that the clergyman omitted the prayer for the President. In June, 1864, Bishop Green made a visitation to "Vicksburg, then in possession of the Federal authorities." He remained five

days, and visited all the Church families remaining in the place, and preached Sunday, June 5. He says, "I feel bound to acknowledge here the courtesy with which I was treated during my stay, by the commanding General and his officers." In October following he writes in his journal, under the date Thursday, the 13th: "On the same day I entered Natchez, then garrisoned by a considerable force of the enemy. It was with difficulty that I gained admittance, but I must acknowledge the kind treatment which I received from the commanding General, after getting in. During the five days which I spent in the city, every facility was allowed me for the prosecution of my work." He preached there Sunday, October 16. Knowing what we do of Bishop Green, and of his conception of his duty, we cannot believe that in those services in Vicksburg and Natchez he used the prayer for the President of the United States; and it is equally impossible to believe that he thus thrust himself into the midst of the garrisoned posts of the enemy to pray for the President of the Confederate States; or that he could have done so without arousing feelings, and subjecting himself to treatment, very different from what is implied in his grateful acknowledgment of the courtesies and consideration which he had received in both cases from the Federal officers. We must conclude that there was mutual concession in omitting those parts of the service involving matters of difference, which, to a moderate and judicious mind, would seem most creditable to all parties. Many other in-

stances of a like spirit of mutual compliance and accommodation might be given.

Unfortunately all the Federal authorities were not thus tolerant. In many cases the military officer, who found himself temporarily in command in a Southern town, somehow managed to persuade himself that he was vested with Episcopal, or even Papal, authority, and that it was his duty to regulate the worship of the Church, and to exact of the local clergyman obedience to his idea of what the canons of the Church and the rubrics of the Prayer Book require. "At Pine Bluff [Ark.], as the Rev. Mr. Trimble was reading the service on Tuesday, as he passed from the Collect for Grace to the Litany, omitting the Prayer for the President, Col. Clayton, the Federal commander, cried out in a loud voice, 'Stop, sir!' and marched into the desk by Mr. Trimble's side, and read the Prayer for the President of the United States, and then resumed his place in the congregation. At the close of the service, Mr. Trimble gave notice that he should not officiate again for the present." It was reported in the Church papers that at Nashville, Tenn., after that city had been occupied by the Federals, General McCook told the Rev. Mr. Harris to "use the prayers just as they are printed in the Prayer Book, or be punished."

One of the most violent outrages committed upon a clergyman of the Church took place in St. Paul's Church, Alexandria, Va., February 9, 1862, when the Rev. Dr. Stewart, rector of the church, during the Litany, was

ordered by an agent of the government to say the Prayer for the President of the United States. Dr. Stewart proceeded without paying any attention to the scandalous interruption; but a captain and his soldiers, who were present in the congregation for the purpose, drew their swords and pistols, intruded into the chancel, seized the clergyman as he knelt and was about to begin the petition to be delivered from all evil and mischief, etc., held pistols to his head, and forced him out of the church, and through the streets, just as he was, in his surplice and stole, and committed him to the guard-house of the 8th Illinois Cavalry. He was soon released, but was not allowed to continue to officiate; and by the same requirement, that prayers should be said for the President of the United States, all the clergy of Alexandria were forced to cease officiating, and their churches were closed.

Upon the occupation of New Orleans by the Federals, the clergy of the Church endeavored to meet the difficulty, and to avoid giving offence to the United States authorities, by omitting Morning and Evening Prayer, using only the Litany and the Office of the Holy Communion. This served for some months, but in September, 1862, the military governor issued an order that "the omission, in the service of the Protestant Episcopal Church in New Orleans, of the prayer for the President of the United States, would be regarded as evidence of hostility to the government of the United States." To this the clergy replied, that in omitting the prayer for those in civil authority they

had endeavored to avoid all occasion of offence, and they denied the right of the civil or military authorities to prescribe in matters ecclesiastical, or to demand of them more than that care to avoid occasion of offence which they had already been diligent in observing. Dr. Fulton says that "Shepley, the military governor, who was a Churchman, admitted that he could not punish men who were acting on such principles, and the matter dropped for a few weeks, until the return of the commanding general, Butler. Then, without previous notice, the service at St. Paul's Church was interrupted by the entrance of an officer, followed by a squad of soldiers with fixed bayonets. The rector Dr. Goodrich, was ordered to desist, and he at once quietly dismissed his congregation with the blessing of peace. The rectors of Calvary Church and Christ Church were also arrested, and a week later the three were sent as prisoners to New York." There they were released on parole, but not allowed to return.

Still more inexcusable was the treatment of the Rev. John H. D. Wingfield, of Trinity Church, Portsmouth, Va., afterwards Missionary Bishop of Northern California. In spite of the most prudent, judicious and inoffensive conduct, in which malice itself can point to no flaw, when he had quietly submitted to the military order forbidding him to officiate in public or in private, and was habitually worshipping in a church whose rector had taken the oath of allegiance, and was using the prayer for the President of the United States, upon the charge that within the screened

choir-gallery, where he worshipped, he had raised his head during the Prayer for the President, Dr. Wingfield was arrested, taken to prison, required to assume the uniform of a criminal, and sentenced to the work of cleaning the streets of Norfolk, "to atone for his disloyalty and treason." So much of the sentence as related to working upon the public streets was remitted, upon a petition numerously signed by the people of Norfolk and Portsmouth, but the order published by General Butler, in granting this partial remission of the sentence, was so grossly false and malicious in the terms applied to the prisoner, that it only added to the infamy of its author and of the whole transaction.

Even the Bishops did not wholly escape. May 2, 1862, Bishop Lay, being for the time at his old home in Huntsville, Alabama, was, with eleven citizens of that community, arrested by General Mitchell, the Federal commander, and imprisoned under guard in one of the rooms of the Court House. No charge whatever was made against them; and upon being brought before General Mitchell the next day, Bishop Lay and two others, chosen to represent the prisoners, were informed by that officer that "against them personally he had no charges. He had arrested them in a time of some excitement, in order to show that no one in the community was beyond arrest, that the innocent must often suffer with the guilty," etc. He then required them, as the condition of being released, to sign a paper denouncing certain acts of guerrilla

warfare, and attacks upon Federal soldiers, which he said had been committed, and to declare that the perpetrators "deserve, and should receive, the punishment of death." These gentlemen naturally objected to being required to denounce, in such terms, persons of whom and of whose deeds they were wholly ignorant, and with whom they were not even charged with having any kind of connection or sympathy. The Bishop and his fellow prisoners were much more than a match for the General in the discussions which followed, maintaining, by citations from Vattel, Kent, and other authorities on international law, their right to refuse to sign the papers submitted to them by General Mitchell. But it is an old saying, *Inter arma leges silent*, and, after an imprisonment of twelve days, they consented to purchase their release, by signing a paper condemning all acts of irregular warfare by citizens not enlisted in the army. May 14, they were released on parole.

These are only a few of the many cases which might be cited. Bishop Lay was again arrested and imprisoned at the end of the war; and Bishop Atkinson was robbed by Sherman's soldiers, and a cocked pistol held to his head, in vain attempt to compel him to comply with their base demands.[1] These things are

[1] It is worth noting that the two Southern Bishops, Atkinson and Lay, who seem to have suffered the greatest personal outrage and indignity at the hands of the Federal forces, were the two who alone attended the General Convention of 1865, and were thus chiefly instrumental in securing the prompt reunion of the separated Dioceses.

not here remembered for the purpose of recalling the bitter anger and resentment which at that time they could not fail to arouse in the breasts of Southern Churchmen. They are mentioned simply because they are part of the history of the time, and because, without taking them into account, no just estimate can be formed of the men who endured such treatment, and yet could possess their souls in patience.

It can easily be imagined how difficult was the position of a clergyman who found himself the rector of a parish within the lines of the Federal occupation. Loyalty to his Bishop, and to his convictions of patriotic duty, required him to pray for the President of the Confederate States. If he should omit to do so, in order that he might not seem to offer an open affront to the military authority, he was still liable to the incalculable annoyances of an irresponsible authority, unless he would consent to use the public prayers for the President of the United States. It was, of course, no question of praying for the President as an act of Christian charity. It was enforced as an open act of penitence and submission to the Federal government, and repudiation of allegiance to the Southern cause.[1]

[1] In Bishop Lay's MS. journal of his experience within the Federal lines, in the fall of 1864, is the following passage, giving a conversation between the Bishop and General Sherman: "He [General Sherman] branched off here to say that he was for letting people pray as they chose, but could not see why people could not pray for Lincoln, or 'even for me.' I replied that there was no objection to praying for any individual, but the use of the prayer in question was the acknowledgment of a political fact."

Understood in that way no honorable man attached to the Southern cause could consent to use the prayer. And underlying all other considerations was the fundamental one, that it was one of the accepted principles of government, both North and South, that the civil authority should not interfere with the freedom of religious worship. A military or civil officer might, perhaps, prohibit the use of a prayer which would be commonly understood as defying the authority of government, and appealing in aid of the public enemy. Freedom of worship might well be understood as limited by the duty of submission to the powers that be. But certainly the powers that be have no authority to command men to pray for them. And the civil authority has nothing to do with enforcing the canons or rubrics of the Church.

This subject very early attracted the attention of the Southern clergy and Bishops. In 1862 the Bishop of Alabama advised his clergy, in case their parishes should at any time lie within the Federal lines, to apply to the officer in command, to know if the clergy would be required to use the prayer for the President of the United States, or forbidden to use the prayer for the President of the Confederate States; and upon his reply that he should require the one or forbid the other, the Bishop says, "I counsel that the church should be closed." This was an extreme position, and Bishop Wilmer's instructions in this case gave rise to much controversy. It was urged against him that, while the secular power has no authority to

prescribe in spiritual matters, the Church, rather than abandon her proper function and public ministrations, may well submit so far as to refrain from public prayers in open defiance and contempt of the powers that be; that *de facto* governments may demand at least this measure of respect; and that where the clergyman, by omitting the prayers for civil rulers altogether, could secure the liberty of serving his people, and maintaining the public offices of the Church, he should do so, and not sacrifice his work, and deprive his people of his ministrations; — that he should to that extent submit to the power of the existing government, civil or military, since he could gain nothing by resisting it.

Another difficulty of somewhat the same nature was encountered by those who found themselves within the Federal lines. The oath of allegiance was tendered to the people, and enforced by various forms of penalty, disability, and threatening. In some cases doubtless it was taken honestly and with a sincere purpose of keeping it. In too many cases, however, it is to be feared that it was taken merely for purposes of advantage, or under the influence of fear, with no honest purpose or desire to observe its terms, any longer than it might be profitable or convenient to do so. The growing temptation to disregard the solemn sanctions of an oath called forth a strong and just rebuke from the Bishop of Alabama: "It is not for me," he says, "in this presence, and acting in my official capacity, to touch upon any question of a purely political nature. It is not for me to say to which of two warring govern-

ments a man should give his adhesion, nor to indicate under what circumstances he may properly transfer his allegiance. It is, however, incumbent upon me to premonish the clergy and laity upon a great question of morals, and to urge them to take heed unto themselves, lest through an unworthy timidity, or an unholy greediness of gain, they make shipwreck of faith and a good conscience, and do dishonor to the name of the great God."

The churches, left vacant by the enforcement of regulations to which the local clergy could not conform, were in many cases supplied with services by Federal chaplains, or other clergymen from the North. The circumstances of the particular case sometimes justified the feeling that such services were an unwarranted intrusion, an outrage upon the rights of both the rector and the parish. In other instances they seem to have been rendered to the mutual credit and edification of all parties concerned. We read, in a communication from Arkansas in *The Church Intelligencer* of March 4, 1864: "The church at Little Rock, I understand, is occupied by the Rev. Mr. Peake, a chaplain in the Federal army, a graduate of Nashota, and formerly Missionary at Crow Wing, Minnesota. He is said to be a kind gentleman, and a good reader and preacher." It seems that he had been recommended to the vestry by the Federal commander, and was officiating with their approval. The writer continues: "A lady who came out soon after the occupation, told me that one Sunday the officiating clergyman

gave notice that Bishop Lay had been heard from (I presume from some letter written before the occupation), and that he expected to make a visitation of the parish early in the spring."

It is perhaps strange that there was not more trouble than there seems to have been, from cases of intrusion, and we may believe that it does indicate a *substratum* of brotherly feeling in the hearts of Churchmen on both sides, when they were brought into personal contact. Bishop McIlvaine and Bishop Bedell both officiated in Virginia, on the southern bank of the Ohio river, during 1863, upon request of the local clergyman; and young Virginia students, graduating during the war at Gambier, seem to have been ordained and put to work in the same section by the Bishop of Ohio. In 1864 the Rev. Dr. Addison, of Wheeling, sent to Bishop Johns a request to be allowed to invite some neighboring Bishop to administer Confirmation in his parish, promising in the selection "to conform as closely as practicable *to his known wishes on the subject.*" Bishop Johns declined to give the permission asked for, but offered "to go himself, on his parole of honor, to perform the service, if the Federal authorities would give him a safe-conduct. The 'safe-conduct' was never given."

And so at last the end came! Lee surrendered his handful of worn and wearied, but undaunted, followers; Johnston and Kirby-Smith followed the same inevitable necessity; and the dream of the Southern Confederacy was over. But how did this affect the ecclesiastical

organization which had taken for its name, "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States of America?"

The name was certainly gone. According to the theory, "The Church must follow nationality," the whole question was settled. And one Diocese in the South, and, so far as appears, one only, accepted promptly and courageously the logical consequences of that principle first advanced by Bishop Polk. Though Bishop Gregg in 1861 seemed to take a different view of the effect of the secession of the State, and spoke of the Church going on with its unity unbroken, and the communion of saints undisturbed, by all the strifes and mutations of the world, yet, apparently under the spell of Bishop Polk's strong character, or else infected by the contagion of national feeling around him, he and his Diocese in 1862 had declared it to be a principle, essential in the external order of the Church, that the Church must be organized so as to be conterminous with the nation. And in the Convention of the Diocese held June 15, 1865, the Bishop of Texas manfully and consistently stood to the principles which he had professed in 1862.

There was no truer man nor a more godly, and no more loyal Churchman, than Alexander Gregg. He said to his Convention, when the war in the trans-Mississippi had hardly well closed: "Our civil and spiritual work and relations, as I have heretofore urged upon you, are closely and inseparably blended, and there is a *Unity* pervading the whole, which cannot

be ignored or disturbed, without endangering *that harmony* in both, which it is one of the cherished objects of Christianity to foster and perpetuate. I suggest therefore, for your consideration, in order to the further promotion of objects so important, and in accordance with the principles upon which we have hitherto acted, the propriety of taking such steps as may bring about, in due time, a return to our former ecclesiastical relations."

Thereupon the Diocesan Convention at once adopted a preamble and resolutions, setting forth in substance that, whereas they had acted in 1862 "in accordance with the practice of the Church in all ages, in yielding allegiance to the government of the Nation, in which the Providence of God had placed her," so now it was resolved, that the action of 1862 be rescinded; and the Constitution of the Church in the United States was acceded to and recognized, and its authority acknowledged. Deputies were elected to the General Convention, and the Bishop was urged to use his efforts to have the General Council of the Church in the Confederate States take similar action. One can but admire the brave simplicity and logical consistency of the course taken by the Bishop of Texas and his Convention.

While the minds of the Southern Bishops were thus turning towards a reunion of the separated Dioceses, an unfortunate complication arose in Alabama, which greatly exasperated the Churchmen of that Diocese, and threatened to interrupt the growing harmony

between Northern and Southern brethren. Bishop Wilmer had been much exercised in mind over the question of the prayers for those in civil authority, and in his Diocesan Convention of 1864 had proposed to memorialize the General Council of the Church in the Confederate States, with a view of having the phraseology of those prayers so altered that they might not be a trap to catch the officiating clergyman, upon every change in the political world. He thought that the terms employed should be so framed as to apply to the existing civil authority, without a too specific determination of the particular officers or government. It is but fair to the Bishop of Alabama, that we should remember that he had urged such alterations in these prayers, during the existence of the Church in the Confederate States.

Upon the collapse of the Confederate government, and the occupation of the entire South by the Federal armies, Bishop Wilmer, May 30, 1865, issued a brief Pastoral to his Diocese, and June 20 followed it with a more elaborate exposition of his judgment upon the situation, as affecting the duty of the clergy and people of his Diocese. He urged entire submission and obedience to the authority of the United States, and loyal compliance with such tests of civil obedience — taking the oath of allegiance when required, and the like — as should be prescribed by the authority of the government. He himself set the example by taking the oath of allegiance to the United States. As there was no longer any Confederate States, prayers for the

President and Congress of the Confederate States must cease. But the Church, as organized within the States of the late Confederacy, had not, in his judgment, been essentially affected, and was still the ecclesiastical organization to which they owed their allegiance. That Church had prescribed a prayer for those in Civil Authority: "The language of that prayer was selected with careful reference to the subject of the prayer — '*All in Civil Authority*'; and she desires for that authority prosperity and long continuance. No one can reasonably be expected to desire a long continuance of *military rule*. Therefore, the prayer is altogether inappropriate and inapplicable to the present condition of things, when no civil authority exists in the exercise of its functions. We may yield a true allegiance to, and sincerely pray for grace, wisdom and understanding in behalf of, a government founded upon force, while at the same time we could not in good conscience ask for its continuance, prosperity," etc.

"When the civil authority shall be restored, it will be eminently proper for the Church to resume the use of that prayer," etc. He adds, at the end of his next paragraph: "It is not for me, in my individual capacity, to introduce into the Liturgy any other form of words than that which the Church, in her collective and legislative capacity, has already established."

"My conclusion is, therefore, and my direction, which I hereby give, that when Civil Authority shall be

restored in the State of Alabama, the Clergy shall use the form entitled 'A Prayer for the President of the United States, and all in Civil Authority,' as it stands in the Book of Common Prayer."

Dr. Fulton says that in a private conversation with a United States officer, seeming to imply that he was an officer in high command in Alabama, Bishop Wilmer so justified the position taken in his Pastoral, that the officer was satisfied, and that thus present trouble was averted. But towards the latter part of September, General Thomas, who commanded in that Military Department, had an order issued through his subordinate, General Woods, charging the Bishop with having a heart filled with malice, hatred, and uncharitableness, with violating the canons of the Church, and exhibiting a factious and disloyal spirit. He pronounced the Bishop to be an unsafe public teacher, and therefore ordered that "the said Richard Wilmer, Bishop of the Diocese of Alabama, and the Protestant Episcopal Clergy of the said Diocese, be, and they are hereby, suspended from their functions, and forbidden to preach or perform divine service, and that their places of worship be closed, until such time as said Bishop and Clergy show a sincere return to their allegiance, and give evidence of a loyal and patriotic spirit, by offering to resume the use of the Prayer for the President and all in civil authority, and by taking the amnesty oath." Upon such return to "a loyal spirit," the order further required, that "application for permission to preach and perform divine service" must

be made "through the military channels to these headquarters," etc.

Even at this late day it is difficult to restrain one's indignation at the insolence and utter lawlessness of such an order.[1] Bishop Wilmer read this military order in the public newspapers, and immediately addressed a courteous note to General Woods, protesting against the order, as in violation of the Constitution of the United States, and of the rights of the Church, and inquiring if it was his purpose to suppress by force the services of the Church. "In reply the General Commanding stated that he would, if necessary, use military force in closing the churches."

Upon receipt of this reply the Bishop issued his Pastoral Letter of September 28, 1865, reiterating his former arguments, and declaring his determination to maintain the authority of the Church in the ordering of its services. He thus ably and effectively sums up the case:

[1] A secular paper, the New York *Daily News*, gave editorial expression to the feelings excited by this order, in the following words: "Could arrogance or assumption go further? We await with anxiety the action which the President shall take upon this most grave assault upon the holiest and dearest of our Constitutional rights. We cannot believe that he will fail to rebuke it with all the energy he can command. Unless he do this, the praises which good people have been showering upon him will no longer gladden his heart or strengthen his hands." Yet it was three months and more before anything was done to relieve the Church in Alabama, and nothing was ever done to rebuke this arrogance of tyranny and lawlessness. The Bishops in Philadelphia expressed their "fraternal regrets" for Bishop Wilmer's manly and unanswerable Protest, but no one dared to criticise the "*General in Command.*"

"In the exercise of my Episcopal discretion, to which I am left by the absence of any authoritative church legislation, I have decided that 'The Prayer' is inapplicable to the existing condition of things. On the other hand, the Military Authorities issue 'Orders' that it shall be used at once, and that all the churches shall be closed until we accede to the demand. Thus the *real issue* before us is this: — Shall the secular or the Ecclesiastical power regulate the worship of the Church? In this conflict of powers — both 'ordained of God' in their respective spheres — the Church labors, for the moment, under serious disadvantages; for we have neither the wish nor the power to oppose force by force. But we must be careful to make it evident that, whilst we yield to military force, in the matter of closing our houses of worship, we concede nothing of Church Prerogative to Secular Authority, Civil or Military. . . .

"I counsel you, beloved brethren of the Clergy and Laity, in the name of God, and for the Honor of His Church, to stand up for and to maintain, at whatever cost, the real issue now before us. Be assured that man has no nobler mission than to defend, and if need be to suffer for, the right. Remember that the communications with God's mercy-seat cannot be obstructed by any created power, and that the compensations of Divine Goodness will supply all our needs, through the riches of His Grace in Christ Jesus, our only Lord and Master."

Within a month of the date of this letter the Pro-

visional Governor, appointed by the President, assumed office, and issued a proclamation declaring the re-establishment of the civil authority. Thereupon the Bishop of Alabama addressed to him a letter, calling his attention to the fact that he and his clergy, in plain violation of the Constitution of the United States, and of a fundamental principle of all our American institutions, were prevented by military force from the performance of their religious function. The very limited character of the civil authority represented by the Governor only allowed of his sending to the Bishop a courteous response, and promising to lay the matter before the President. In due course Bishop Wilmer was informed that the matter had been laid before President Johnson, "and that there was no prospect of the order being rescinded."

Thinking that the whole Church must needs be interested in so flagrant a violation of the principles of religious liberty, and that it would become the National Council of the Church, the General Convention which met in Philadelphia the first week in October, 1865, to interpose at least a protest against this arbitrary act of a military officer in time of peace, the Bishop of Alabama, in a brief letter to several of the Northern Bishops, informed them of the situation of the Church in his Diocese. He did not ask or expect aid in his own behalf. He writes: "Not that I personally solicit your help. By God's grace I trust to maintain my stand. But the time is propitious, and the opportunity offers, to affirm and maintain a great principle."

This appeal met with no adequate response. It is said that some of the Bishops were disposed to enter a protest against the wrong done to the Bishop and Diocese of Alabama, but, if so, nothing came of it more than a futile visit of one or two of the Bishops to Washington. Military power still defied the Constitution and laws of the country, and suppressed the worship of the Church.

November 27, Bishop Wilmer addressed a letter to the President, saying that, being informed that the order complained of had been communicated to the President of the United States, he could no longer consider it the mere act of a subordinate, but, not being rescinded, "it is virtually sustained by the President." He therefore feels justified in calling the attention of the President to the true nature of the act as a violation of the Constitution, and an interference with the rights of the Church, and with his rights as an individual citizen accused of no violation of the law of the land:

"For all which reasons, and chiefly for the high reason that the secular power has no authority in the Church of God, either in framing her creed, or in prescribing her worship, or in any way interfering with her functions, the undersigned, in behalf as aforesaid, makes his solemn protest to your Excellency against said 'General Orders,' acknowledges no authority in them, and claims in equity and Constitutional law that they be rescinded."

Dr. Fulton seems to imply that the letter to the

President eventually produced the revocation of the "Order." But it was not until January 1, 1866, that the Bishop had received assurance that the order would be revoked, and a few days later he received notice of its actual revocation.[1] He thereupon, January 13, notified his clergy to use the prayer for the President of the United States. But for the unjustifiable interference of the military power he would have given that direction two months earlier, as soon as he had been able to confer with his brethren at the final Council of the Church in the Confederate States, held in Augusta, November 8–10, 1865. Thus Bishop Wilmer had faithfully maintained his position, and "the Diocese of Alabama had not been frightened from her propriety by the dictate or menace of any secular power, civil or military."

In his final statement of this whole affair to the Diocesan Convention of January 17, 1866, Bishop Wilmer said: "Some day, when the present excitement of feeling has passed away, the point which I have taken, and the issue which I have made, will be vindicated before men, as it is now, I verily believe, before God."

Unquestionably he was right in the position which he took, and in the issue which he made, as to the right of the Church and of the individual to resist the attempt of the secular power to interfere in a matter

[1] Dr. McConnell, in his "History of the Church" (page 373), makes this curious misstatement: "A letter from the Bishop to President Lincoln [*sic*] produced an immediate revocation of the Order."

of religious worship. Bishop Wilmer, shut out of his churches, and all his clergy silenced, and yet manfully contending for his rights under the Constitution and laws of the country, and for the proper liberties of the Church of God, contrasts most favorably with the House of Bishops in Philadelphia, expressing their "fraternal regrets" that he should have asserted and maintained those rights and liberties. But it is not at all clear that his original position as to the impropriety of using the prayer for the civil authority was well taken. Indeed, it seems to have been a most mistaken conclusion, into which he was betrayed by the excitement of those trying times. No other Bishop in the South felt the same way about it, which of itself raises a strong presumption against its correctness; and a calm consideration of the principles involved seems to sustain the course approved by all but the Bishop of Alabama.

Bishop Wilmer was an able man and a godly man; he was also a man of very strong feelings. Under the difficulties of his situation he was led to approach the subject more as an advocate than as a judge. To his Diocesan Convention of 1864 he had complained, that the phraseology of the prayer for those in civil authority was unsatisfactory, and not properly expressive of what we should ask for in behalf of our rulers. And this criticism was fully justified. The words of that prayer, as they stand, and as use has made them familiar to us, and has made them sound appropriate in our ears, have really no proper application to the civil

authorities under our system of government. In fact, the prayer is taken from the English Prayer Book. Several clauses of the English prayer are omitted, and the language of so much as is retained has been slightly altered to amend certain archaisms of the original, but the essential character of the prayer has not been destroyed or changed. Its whole thought and spirit have relation to loyalty to a personal ruler whose authority is inherent and life-long. It breathes the love and allegiance of the subject to the person of the sovereign. It is not impossible to believe that the personal character of our first President, Washington, may unconsciously have influenced the minds of those who, during his presidency, were settling the forms of our public services, and may have caused them to retain so much of this purely personal element in the prayers for those in civil authority, by naming only the President of the United States specifically, and including all others in one brief phrase. The "Proposed Book" of 1785, by simply referring to "all in authority, legislative, judicial, and executive in these United States," gives a turn to the meaning much more impersonal, and really more in accordance with the altered conditions of modern, and especially of republican, government. However that may be, in our use of the prayer, as it stands in our Prayer Book, we employ the words out of their true literal meaning, and adapt them to our purpose as best we can, largely eliminating their personal element, and making them expressive of quite different thoughts and feelings from those naturally

and primarily belonging to them. So we cannot allow the correctness of Bishop Wilmer's premise, that "the words of that prayer were selected with careful reference to the subject of the prayer — '*All in Civil Authority.*'" The words were taken, practically as they stand, from an English prayer framed upon theories of government, and expressing feelings and ideas, quite different from what our situation in America calls for; and they could never have been used in the United States, except by such an accommodation of the language as has been above suggested. Bishop Wilmer himself felt this when in the very Pastoral under consideration he says: "The Church uses the 'Prayer for the President' not so much as a *person*, as an *impersonation* of the Civil Authority."

But the fallacy in the argument does not lie in the exact or inexact meaning or use of words. The question is: Shall the Church refuse to pray for the Civil Authority because that particular territory in which the Church is situated is held under military rule? In June and September, 1865, Alabama had again become a part of the United States. In recognition of this fact Bishop Wilmer had himself taken the oath of allegiance, and in this very Pastoral advises his people to do the same. The United States was a country under civil government; "the President of the United States and all others in authority" were exercising the functions of civil government. Grant that a particular part of its territory, Alabama, for instance, was, under some abnormal conditions, denied the

benefits of civil government; grant that it was wrongfully and unconstitutionally denied those benefits. But, because of this, shall the Church in Alabama, the Bishop and clergy, retaliate and say: "We will not pray for the civil authority until the civil authority is reestablished here"? The President of the United States was the head of a civil government, though at that particular time he was governing Alabama by his military authority. There was all the more need that the Church everywhere should pray for the civil authority, that it might be strengthened and restored to its proper exercise in all parts of the land. As in every other Southern Diocese, so in Alabama, the Church, upon its own principles, should have prayed for the powers that be. Much as the Bishop of Alabama is to be revered and loved for his noble qualities of mind and of heart, much as he is to be respected for his brave and determined assertion and maintenance of the proper liberties of the Church, we cannot say that all the other Southern Bishops were wrong, and that he was right, in this point on which he and they differed.

And in conclusion, as to this painful but, in some respects, interesting, question, Bishop Wilmer, in saying that it was not for him in his "individual capacity to introduce into the Liturgy any other form of words than that which the Church, in her collective and legislative capacity, has already established," seems to have forgotten that in his Episcopal capacity it was quite within his power to provide a prayer to be

used in any emergency for which provision is not made in the Prayer Book. He had put out special prayers to be used during the War. If he now found the prayers for all in Civil Authority unsuitable, he might have put out prayers to be used in the churches of his Diocese, for the President of the United States, in such form as seemed to him most fit. Even if such prayers had not satisfied the ecclesiastico-military potentates of the Military District of Alabama, they would at least have been more consistent with Bishop Wilmer's declared position, than to have omitted all public prayers for those in authority at a time when they had special need of the prayers of all good people.

It has been asserted by some that the course of the Bishop of Alabama was strictly in accordance with his understanding of the canons and rubrics of the Church, which he felt bound to obey; and that, while he might have issued special prayers for the authorities of the United States, he was under no obligation to do so. To sustain this position it is pointed out that, though the Confederate States no longer existed, the Church in the Confederate States retained its organization, and in the summer of 1865 no one could certainly know that it would not continue as a separate and independent Church. That Church had imposed a prayer for the President of the Confederate States and had not provided for any other; and, until that Church should authorize another prayer, the Bishop of Alabama might well feel that he could not allow the President of the United States to be prayed for by his clergy.

This argument will not bear examination when it is alleged in behalf of Bishop Wilmer; and for this reason: In March, 1862, when the Rev. Richard H. Wilmer was consecrated Bishop of Alabama, he had been, up to his Consecration, a Priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia. The State of Virginia, in May, 1861, had seceded from the Federal Union. But the Diocese of Virginia took no action to withdraw from the Church in the United States until May, 1862. Her delegates, appointed to confer with other Southern Dioceses, had agreed that a separate organization was necessary, and had agreed upon a new organization; but the proposed Constitution had not been adopted by the Diocese of Virginia, nor by any Southern Diocese, and no change had been made in the Prayer Book, nor was any change made until November, 1862. Yet from the spring of 1861 the Rev. Dr. Wilmer had not only ceased using the prayer for the President of the United States, but, from the time of the accession of the State of Virginia to the Confederate States, he and all the clergy of the Diocese of Virginia had used the prayer for the President of the Confederate States, upon the ground that it was their duty to pray for "the powers that be." Bishop Meade had authorized the use of the Prayer for the President of the Confederate States upon this principle, as had all the other Southern Bishops; and we do not understand that Dr. Wilmer had objected to it. Therefore, when in the summer of 1865 the Bishop of Alabama, by taking the oath of allegiance

to the United States, and by recommending his people to do the same, had recognized the restored authority of the United States government, there was exactly the same reason for using the prayer for the President of the United States that there had been for praying for the President of the Confederate States in 1861. He did not think it necessary in 1861 to wait until the Church had legislated for the change of the Prayer Book; there can be no valid reason assigned why in 1865 it was necessary to wait for such change. In the first case the authority of the Bishop, acting under the necessity of the situation, had been sufficient; the same authority was quite sufficient in 1865. It was found to be so in all the other Southern Dioceses; there is no reason why it was not the same in Alabama.

In most of the Southern Dioceses the prayer for the President of the United States was resumed without any special action, so soon as it was realized that all hope of Southern independence had departed. But the Bishop of Virginia has, in his Address to his Council, September 20, 1865, recorded his action in the case with his reasons for same. He says: "As soon as I received reliable intelligence of the entire failure of the painful and protracted struggle for the independence of the Confederate States, and the reestablishment of the Federal authority, I felt it incumbent upon me to prepare a brief circular, addressed to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Virginia, recognizing the duty of prompt and honest obedience to the existing government, and the obliga-

tion to pray for 'those in authority.' For this purpose, I had no hesitation in recommending the use of that form to which we had long been accustomed, and from which any deviation now might be liable to the suspicion of unbecoming subterfuge.

"Whatever be the character of the military agencies appointed in certain localities, there can be no doubt in reference to the President of the United States and other Civil officers of the General Government. They are unquestionably 'in authority.' To them the prayer is strictly applicable, and for them it should be offered, even by those who scruple to use it on behalf of others.

"It has been gravely asserted, that the order prohibiting the *omission* of that prayer in our public worship is an invasion of our religious liberty, and as such should not be regarded. I am happy to say that my own action, though delayed in its transmission to many of the parishes, by the interruption of all mail communication, antedated any extra-ecclesiastical order concerning the prayer. I was, therefore, at the time under no apprehension of even seeming to surrender religious liberty to what has been pronounced unlawful dictation. Truth and justice, however, require me now to say, that whether that requisition was advisable or not, I cannot see that it is justly liable to any such odious charge. The prayer, which includes nothing to which an enlightened conscience need take exception, is not a new form prepared and enjoined upon us by 'the powers that be,' but our own

adopted form, which has been used by the Church for three quarters of a century. Its discontinuance at this particular juncture would inevitably be regarded as a public reflection on the civil authority. That it should insist, as it has done, that no such offensive change in the service of the Church shall now be made, but that those services shall in this respect and for this reason be conducted as heretofore, avoiding any omission which would be considered a formal slight and indignity offered to the government, appears to me rather an act of self-protection than officious and unlawful dictation.

"Even if the requisition were an unlawful interference, I see not how this could absolve us from that which is in itself, and independently of the action of others, a clear duty expressly enjoined in Scripture. It may be humiliating and painful in practice, but not more so than other mortifications of flesh and spirit, which are not, therefore, less obligatory — less salutary or less acceptable in the sight of God. I trust, then, we will not be disturbed by other opinions, which, however plausibly presented, I must disapprove as fallacious, or suffer ourselves to be deterred from a clear duty by the imputation of surrendering to military authority our precious heritage of religious liberty."

Such is the argument of Bishop Johns. To the present writer it seems most fallacious. If the civil or military authority can rightfully order a prayer to be used, it can enforce the order; and then General

Thomas's action was justifiable in closing all the churches of the Diocese of Alabama, and suspending the Bishop and his clergy from the exercise of their function, and requiring them to apply at military headquarters, through the ordinary military channels, for permission to minister the Word and Sacraments of God! Bishop Wilmer was wrong in refusing to pray for "the powers that be," but he was right when he refused to regulate the services of his Diocese in accordance with a military order. Bishop Johns was right in requiring his clergy to pray for the President of the United States, just as soon as he felt certain of the permanent establishment of the authority of the Federal government; but he is clearly wrong when he reasons from the fact of his duty to the right of either the military or the civil authority to prescribe the performance of a purely spiritual act. Such an attempted prescription is in violation of a fundamental principle of our civil Constitution, and should not be tolerated by the Church.

VII

PEACE, AND THE REUNION OF THE DIOCESES

"PEACE hath its victories no less renowned than war." It is one of the highest honors of the Southern soldier that, when he had laid down his arms in 1865, he went back to his home, or what was left of it, and never thought again of taking them up. He revered the character and followed the example of his noble leader, General Lee, who spent the rest of his life teaching the arts of peace, and instilling into the young men of the South lessons of peace and of patriotism.

And in studying the brief history of the Church in the Confederate States we cannot but be proud and thankful that, when the War ceased, the separation caused by the War ceased with it. The Church of Christ showed then the spirit of Christ, and at once put behind it all wrath, bitterness, anger, and the memory of wrongs done or suffered, and, making no terms or conditions on either side, but with sole reliance upon the love and honor which should be between brethren, closed the breach, and was again one in heart and mind, and in that visible unity which witnessed to men their Oneness in Christ.

And that the reality of that vital Unity, which thus asserted itself in the life of the Church, and which was

truly the work of the Spirit, and not the contrivance or achievement of man, may clearly appear, it is necessary to mark somewhat distinctly the human elements of strife and discord which entered into the problem, as men saw it, at the close of hostilities in the spring of 1865.

The first important step towards reconciliation and reunion was properly taken by the Presiding Bishop[1] of the Church in the United States. In God's good providence his personal relations with the Southern Bishops, and his known attitude towards some of the vexed questions of the day, assured him of a favorable hearing in any proposition he might make. He addressed to each of the Southern Bishops an affectionate letter, inviting and urging them to come and take their accustomed places in the General Convention, which was to meet in Philadelphia on the fourth day of the month of October.

This letter was dated July 12, 1865, and contains among other things the following passages, quoted once and again throughout the Southern Church during the next few critical months:

"I consider it a duty especially incumbent on me, as the Presiding Bishop, to testify my affectionate attachment to those amongst my colleagues from whom I have been separated during those years of suffering and calamity; and to assure you personally of the cordial welcome which awaits you at our approaching General Convention. In this assurance, however, I

[1] The Rt. Rev. John Henry Hopkins, Bishop of Vermont.

pray you to believe that I do not stand alone. I have corresponded on the subject with the Bishops, and think myself authorized to state that they sympathize with me generally in the desire to see the fullest representation of churches from the South, and to greet their brethren in the Episcopate with the kindest feelings.

"The past cannot be recalled, and though it may not soon be forgotten, yet it is the part of Christian wisdom to bury it forever, rather than to suffer it to interfere with the present and the future interests of unity and peace.

"I trust therefore that I shall enjoy the precious gratification of seeing you and your delegates in proper place at the regular triennial meeting."

Of course, the one chief difficulty in all such cases is the different point of view. The case of Bishop Polk would have constituted an all but insurmountable obstacle in the path, but that difficulty had been providentially removed. Still, in the North, that remained a very real and serious embarrassment. Then there was the case of the Consecration of Bishop Wilmer and of the erection of Arkansas into a Diocese. These two, however, were felt to be mainly technical. The real difficulty on that side lay in the fact that Northern Churchmen had got into the habit of speaking, and perhaps thinking, of the separation as in some way schismatical. Bishop Wilmer's Consecration was spoken of as a schismatical Consecration, and the whole attitude of the Southern Church seemed to Southern

Churchmen to be misapprehended and misrepresented at the North. The General Convention of 1862 had wisely rejected the several resolutions proposed by the more radical members, in which Southern Churchmen were denounced as seditious and schismatical, and had adopted instead resolutions of a comparatively moderate and generous character. But the rejected resolutions were understood to represent the views of many influential men in the Church; and it was well known that many of those, who in 1862 had most earnestly opposed such injurious reflections upon their absent brethren, had based their objection upon the fact of absence, and the want of any evidence before the Convention, except public rumor and hearsay, upon the questions involved. It seemed universally taken for granted in that Convention that, if the Southern Dioceses had presumed to recognize the authority of the Confederate government, and to organize the Church upon the theory of a permanent new nationality, they would deserve the worst that could be said of them. The comparatively moderate and, on the whole, kindly resolutions finally adopted, while they endeavored to avoid intruding into politics, were yet framed upon the theory that Southern Churchmen, as Churchmen, owed a sacred allegiance to that interpretation of the Constitution which the North had espoused. It did not seem to have entered into the minds of the members of that Convention that, without reference to the merits or demerits of the Southern cause, it was not only a matter of necessity,

but of duty as well, that the Church, in the presence of an organized civil government, should eschew party strife and submit to "the powers that be"; and that separation thus caused could not justly be called schism. These things had not been forgotten in the South, nor could they be ignored. Even the loving letter of Bishop Hopkins already quoted, which did so much to prepare the way for a better mutual understanding and the happiness of a perfect reconciliation, did not escape this error. He spoke of the continuance of the separate organization of the Southern Dioceses as being necessarily a schism. His affectionate and earnest entreaties and warnings were against making a schism in the Body.

Southern Churchmen indignantly repudiated the charge of schism. They rightly repelled the word and the thought when applied in any way to their action past or in prospect. They pointed out that schism has to do with the unity of the Church as expressed, not in legislative organization, but in the union and fellowship of the members in the One Body; and they claimed that they had made no breach in that unity of faith and fellowship. They had only recognized the facts of their situation, and in the disruption of political connections which actually had existed, and which they had believed to be both necessary and permanent, they had acted as the situation seemed to require for the life of the Church. They had been wrong in their estimate of the permanence of the separation, but no one could doubt the perfect honesty

and sincerity of their course. And in the very act of effecting their separate organization they had protested, in the most solemn manner, that they had done, and would do, nothing which should break the fellowship of faith and love with their Northern brethren. They pointed with confidence to the record of their proceedings and to the Pastoral Letter of their Bishops, published when the War was raging most fiercely, and they defied the eye of malice to discover in them any trace of a schismatical mind or spirit. And having, as they believed, been providentially forced into a separate organization, they felt now that as Christian men, clergy and laity, in an organized branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, they had a right to consider and to determine what course they should take for the future, freely and fully, and undeterred by any cry of schism. The eloquent Bishop of Virginia put the case as to the charge of schism most admirably to his Council of September 20, 1865:

"The separation of the Southern Dioceses from the organization with which they were happily connected, was occasioned not by any disagreement in doctrine or discipline, or manner of worship, but by political changes, which rendered the continuance of that connection impracticable. The preservation of the order and purity of the Church, in this section of the country, called for a separate organization, which was accordingly effected with a careful avoidance of any alteration which could impair that unity of spirit which our holy religion enjoins. 'The exigency of the necessity'

furnished the divine commission under which this association was formed, and constitutes a divine sanction for its continuance, unless good and sufficient reasons to the contrary are manifest. The mere cessation of the causes in which it originated does not, as a matter of course, dissolve it, and restore the relations which previously existed. . . . Under these circumstances, it could not, on any principle of reason or revelation, be regarded as justly liable to the imputation of schism, which is 'a causeless separation from the external communion of any church.' Our organization was no breach of communion, and for the external separation which it formed there was obvious and ample cause."

To Bishop Hopkins, who, as we have seen, had invited the Southern Dioceses to return at once to their old relations with the Church in the United States, and had urged that to continue their separate organization would be to create a schism, the Bishop of Alabama replied in a published letter. In the first place he affirmed that, "Schism, as defined by the standard authorities, has reference primarily to the rending of communion, and cannot be truly predicated of branches of the Church of Christ which maintain intercommunion." In illustration he cited the case of the Churches of England, Scotland, the United States, and Canada, and the relations existing between them. He urged various arguments in favor of delay, in order that time might heal the many wounds caused by the War; and he maintained that the spirit manifested by many Northern Churchmen justified the apprehension,

that terms of reconciliation might be imposed, if too speedy advances to reunion were made, which Southern Churchmen could not accept. One argument advanced by him must at that time have been most effective, and all but convincing. He called attention to the fact that the class of laymen in the South, from among whom the lay deputies to General Convention had always been chosen, were, almost without exception, men who by the United States government were excluded from the general amnesty proclaimed at the end of the War; and that those classes had recently been declared by the President to be "unpardoned rebels and traitors." Since the General Convention of 1862 had felt it to be the duty of the Church to support the government, how could the Southern Dioceses feel any confidence that their lay deputies to the General Convention of 1865 would be received as such?[1] Those who do not remember the experiences of those days cannot appreciate the force which such an argument carried. There was little desire in the South among Churchmen to perpetuate division, and to add

[1] The four lay deputies chosen to represent the Diocese of North Carolina at the General Convention in Philadelphia, October 1865, all belonged to the classes excluded from amnesty, though one of them had been able to have his disabilities removed.

It would probably have been impossible to find four laymen, in any Southern Diocesan Convention, at all competent to represent the Diocese in the General Convention, who did not belong to the classes excluded from amnesty.

The late Governor Thomas H. Seymour, of Connecticut, told the writer that, being at Chapel Hill, in June, 1868, to deliver the Commencement Oration before the University of North Carolina, he

another broken fragment to the already too numerous divisions of Christendom; but there was a very serious apprehension lest too great haste might occasion mortifying and injurious rebuffs. For these reasons Bishop Wilmer felt bound to decline the invitation of the Presiding Bishop. The Bishop of Alabama was a strong and eloquent writer, and his letter to Bishop Hopkins was the more influential in the South from the fact that the Bishop of Mississippi, one of the mildest and sweetest natures in all the Church, North or South, appended his signature to it, with a line to say that he entirely agreed in its arguments and conclusions. In the summer of 1865 the people of the South could not feel sure of the state of feeling in the North towards any sectional matter.[1]

Diocesan Councils had been held during the month of May, 1865, in Alabama, Mississippi, and Georgia,

dined with a distinguished company of gentlemen, including among others the Hon. Thomas Ruffin, former Chief-Justice of North Carolina and one of the most eminent of American lawyers, the Hon. Wm. A. Graham, who had been Governor, Senator, Secretary of the Navy, and Whig candidate for Vice-President, Ex-Governor Swain, President of the University, the Hon. Wm. H. Battle, of the State Supreme Court, and Ex-Governor Zebulon B. Vance. He was told, as an illustration of the unnatural condition of public affairs in the South, that under the Reconstruction Acts, which had just gone into effect, *the only persons in the room who could vote were the two negro men who waited upon the table.*

[1] The following from "The Life of Bishop Hopkins" may serve to illustrate the feeling expressed in Bishop Wilmer's letter. "On the 6th of May, 1865, three weeks after General Lee's surrender, a leading editorial in the *Episcopal Recorder* of Philadelphia, then the chief Low Church organ, demanded of the government that some of

but the uncertainty of the times and the small attendance of members had prevented any important action. Nothing was done with reference to reunion: it was then too soon for the question to be considered. But Bishop Hopkins had opened the question by his letter of July 12, and the response of the Southern Bishops, even when most adverse, as in the case of Bishop Wilmer and Bishop Green, soon made reunion the great issue before the Church.

August 11, an adjourned meeting of the Diocesan Council of Georgia was held in Emmanuel Church, Athens. In his address to this Council, Bishop Elliott spoke out strongly upon the duty and necessity of the eventual return of the Diocese to its former relations with the Church in the United States. He had been upon specially affectionate and confidential relations with Bishop Hopkins, and the prompt and generous action of the Presiding Bishop, in addressing his letter to his Southern brethren, had moved him, as it had moved all the Bishops; and there was no uncertain sound in Bishop Elliott's strong presentation of the importance of renewing the old bonds of union

the leading Bishops and clergy at the South should be hanged, on the ground that they had been leaders in the original movement for secession. As the General Convention was to meet that same year, in October, in that same city of Philadelphia, one can easily see how difficult it must have been to persuade Southern Churchmen that they would be welcomed to its sessions as brethren." And again: "With such editorials as that of the *Episcopal Recorder*, and the reprinting in similar organs, for weeks, of every paragraph that could keep up Northern prejudice against Southern Churchmen, the prospect of immediate success [in the reunion of the Dioceses] was not cheering."

between all parts of the Church. He did not wish to contemplate the prospect of permanent separation. But Bishop Elliott was equally strong in the expression of his opposition to immediate action by individual Southern Dioceses, looking towards representation in the approaching General Convention. As during the continuance of the war he had been most free in expressing, even from the pulpit, the national aspirations of the Southern people, so now he embodied that sentiment of sensitive regard for the memories of the recent past, and that apprehension as to the treatment which might possibly be accorded to Southern Churchmen by their Northern brethren, which made so many good men fear the effects of a too precipitate movement for reunion. He said to his Convention of August 11, 1865: "In her action, under the present condition of affairs, the Diocese of Georgia must remember that she has to act, not only for herself, but also for her sister Dioceses, with whom she was for a time united. She owes it to her own character and dignity to keep faith with them, and to arrange a reunion which will not place any of them in a worse condition than it may place herself. . . . My opinion is that the Council made up from the Dioceses in the States which seceded, should meet in November, . . . and should there decide upon the course to be pursued. . . . It will cause delay of a month or two in the adjustment of the affairs of the Church, but better that than a hasty reunion, which will leave subjects to be discussed and reopened, which had better not be touched after

once they have been talked over and settled. It would prevent, 'tis true, our Diocese from being represented at the next General Convention in both Houses, but that might be a blessing, when wounds are so recent, and when topics connected with the exciting subjects of the conflict of the last four years must necessarily come up for consideration. After such years of strife, there must be some readjustment, which had better take place while our Dioceses are not represented in the General Convention. It would allow that body a much freer scope for discussion, and might save us much pain and irritation."[1]

It is quite plain from this that Bishop Elliott was not at all prepared to consider immediate reunion. Much about this same time he addressed a letter to the Editor of *The Church Journal*, of New York, taking the same ground, in favor of postponing the movement for reunion, upon even more distinct and specific suggestions of the mortifying experiences to be apprehended by Southern Churchmen, who should thus

[1] Bishop Elliott at this time seemed disposed to take a position similar to that of Bishop Wilmer, and to postpone ecclesiastical reunion until the Southern States had been restored to their proper civil *status*. His words, in this same address, are: "The Diocese of Georgia will, therefore, as soon as her civil Government is restored, be in a condition in which, as I said before, there will be no political or canonical hindrance to her reunion with the Dioceses with which for so many years, she acted in harmony and peace." But in using this language he probably assumed, as a matter of course, the speedy restoration of civil and political relations between all the States of the Union, and had not contemplated the possibility of any alternative. He probably meant simply to indicate a time, not to suggest a condition, of returning.

venture to trust the magnanimity of their brethren of the North, and very openly reflecting upon some of his Southern brethren, who were disposed to adopt the course which he disapproved.[1] His Council seemed of a different mind, and gave a much warmer and more sympathetic response to the idea of an early restoration of the old relations; and while declaring that the Diocese of Georgia was prepared to resume those relations "whenever in the judgment of the Bishop it shall be consistent with the good faith" which they owed to the other Southern Dioceses and Bishops, it took care to provide that the delegates elected to the Council of the Southern Church, should be authorized also to represent the Diocese in the General Convention at Philadelphia, "if any contingencies should arise whereby it should become expedient" that the Diocese should be represented in that Convention.

The first strong and unequivocal word in behalf of prompt and unhesitating reunion, after the action of the Diocese of Texas the middle of June, seems to have come from North Carolina. Bishop Atkinson about this time took up the matter with a clearness of view and distinctiveness of utterance characteristic of him.

[1] Bishop Gregg felt himself and his Diocese so closely touched by these reflections of the Bishop of Georgia, that he replied in an open letter addressed to Bishop Elliott, through the columns of the *Church Intelligencer*. There are few finer specimens of clear and cogent reasoning, manly dignity, and sweet Christian courtesy, than in this letter of Bishop Gregg to one whom he loved and revered, but in this case could not follow.

The fortunes of war had left his kinsman, Bishop Lay, stranded, so to speak, in the little town of Lincolnton, N.C. Bishop Lay had in 1861 resigned to Bishop Brownell his jurisdiction as a Missionary Bishop of the Church in the United States, and had been elected Bishop of the Diocese of Arkansas, upon its organization under the Constitution and Canons of the Church of the Confederate States in November, 1862. The return of the Southern Dioceses into union with the Church in the United States, a very simple matter in the case of the other Southern Bishops, was to him a question of very grave complications, since his Diocese had been practically wiped out of existence by the destructive ravages of war, and he had resigned his work as Missionary Bishop. His *status* in the Church, upon the accomplishment of reunion, promised to give more ground for doubt and contention than even the Consecration of Bishop Wilmer. But he cared not to consider any mere personal aspects of so great a question, and readily joined Bishop Atkinson in a letter to Bishop Elliott, Presiding Bishop of the Church in the Confederate States, expressing their "decided opinion," that "considerations of principle, and of expediency as well, require us to restore the ecclesiastical relations which existed before the war." To this letter Bishop Elliott replied, saying that he did "not see how we can avoid returning into connection with the Church in the Union." This reply, however, must be interpreted in accordance with Bishop Elliott's plainly expressed purpose of postponing action until

after the General Council appointed to meet November 8. But as that would be the month following the meeting of the General Convention in Philadelphia, and as it was most desirable that there should be some consultation and concert of action among the Bishops with reference to the General Convention, Bishop Elliott, as Presiding Bishop, agreed to call together the Bishops of the South for mutual counsel and advice before the meeting of the Council. The date and place appointed by him were September 27, 1865, at Augusta, Georgia.

This then was the situation in the South at the end of the summer of 1865, as the time for the meeting of the General Convention drew near. Distant Texas had by the middle of June gone back to its old position, without hesitation or suggestion of condition. But Texas was not only distant, far removed from sympathetic contact with the rest of the Southern Dioceses, but it was little more than a Missionary District, which had hardly had a Bishop in the General Convention, and had been wholly unrepresented in the one national Council of the Southern Church. Texas counted for little in making public opinion in the Southern Church in 1865. The Bishops of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi were distinctly opposed to immediate reunion, and took an aggressive attitude in behalf of the policy of holding the General Council in November. It seemed that they had not only their own Dioceses behind them, in standing for this policy, but that they represented the general sentiment of the

South. The Bishop of South Carolina was declaredly for permanent separation; and while Bishop Johns, as we shall presently see, earnestly desired, and most eloquently pleaded for, immediate restoration of the old relations, his clergy and laity were against him, and soon after, in the meeting of their Council, September 20, gave emphatic expression to that opposition. Florida, weak and scattered, even more negligible than Texas, had given no sign of diocesan life for a year or two, and exercised no influence upon the situation. Tennessee and Louisiana, both deprived of their Bishops,[1] had been so paralyzed by the course of hostilities that they had been able to assemble no Diocesan Convention since 1861, and so had never become formally united with the "Church in the Confederate States." In this situation of affairs the Diocese of North Carolina met in Diocesan Council Wednesday, September 13, in Christ Church, Raleigh.

Among the Southern Bishops in 1865, Bishop Atkinson stood next to Bishop Elliott in personal distinction, power, and influence. With the removal of Bishop Meade, Bishop Otey, and Bishop Polk, these two, Elliott and Atkinson, remained the most notable Southern Bishops in the eyes and to the minds of the Church at large. Bishop Elliott embodied the strong national feeling of the South developed by the war; Bishop Atkinson had all along subordinated every local and national feeling to his high conception of the freedom of the Church, and its superiority to all

[1] Bishop Otey had died April 23, 1863.

worldly interests and institutions. In 1861 he had maintained boldly, and at the cost of misunderstanding and misrepresentation, that the Church was no ways affected in its constitutional connections and obligations by the civil and political disruption caused by the secession of the States; now in 1865, while holding strongly the absolute lawfulness and propriety of the action of the Southern Dioceses in forming their separate organization, he was equally emphatic in asserting that, the cause, and the only cause, of separation being removed, it was the plain duty of the Diocese to resume its former relations with the Church in the United States. He repelled the suggestion of anything schismatical in the action of the Church in the Confederate States, but he so far agreed with Bishop Hopkins that he saw great probability and imminent danger of the development of schism, should the Southern Dioceses persist in maintaining a separate organization, after the sole cause, alleged by them to justify the separation, had ceased to exist. The organization might not itself be schismatical in theory, but he felt that the spirit by which it would be maintained would be schismatical, and that the situation would surely, unavoidably, produce the worst practical fruits of schism. He put the situation very clearly before his Council: "We believe that schism is a sin, as well as a source of innumerable and incalculable evils. And surely wilful separation from a Church, with which we have hitherto been in union, is schism, or schism is a very mysterious and impalpable thing, a senti-

mental grief, not a plain matter of fact, taking place before the eyes of men. An enforced separation is not schism. . . . The Church in the Confederate States was not schismatical as to the Church in the United States, because war and diversities of political government kept them apart. But when there is no war and no diversity of political government, then to remain apart, because we cannot bear each other's presence, that is schism and great uncharitableness, and so the common-sense of all men, who believe that there is such a sin, will ultimately decide.

"This is a question which, it is certain, requires of us all of calm and dispassionate wisdom that we can command, and, what is even more important, a supreme reference to the honor of our Lord and the welfare of His Church, making us willing to sacrifice to these objects whatever tends merely to gratify our own feelings, or to gain the favor of our fellow-men. To me it is plain that this is a critical moment in the history of the Church, both at the North and the South — that on the decision it shall now reach and the action it shall now pursue, it will depend very much whether in the future it shall sink to the level of a mere sect, or rather a bundle of hostile sects, or shall maintain its claim to be a pure and vigorous branch of the Church Catholic, rising continually into wider usefulness and higher influence, until at length it shall become the Church, not merely in the United States, but of the American people."

He did not confine himself to the purely ecclesiastical

aspects of the question. He was no less a true patriot than a loyal Churchman. He had a heart and an intelligence responsive to the necessities of his people and his country. He looked beyond the limits of the immediate horizon: "Let us then endeavor to forecast the future as well as we can, for we are not deciding any ephemeral question. The conclusion to which we shall now come is one in which our children's children have a deep interest as well as ourselves. The authority of the government of the United States is reestablished over the South, and there is a universal disclaimer of any intention or desire to attempt to unsettle it. But it is very far from being certain what the nature of the Union is to be which has been cemented with so much blood. Is it to be one of constraint, or one of affection? Is the South to be added to the melancholy list of oppressed nationalities — to become an American Poland or Hungary, to live by the side of the North in a state of chronic turbulence, suspicious and suspected, hating and hated? A doom so mournful and so humiliating is certainly not to be desired. Can it be averted? To me it seems very much to depend on the Ministers of Religion. They have a great deal to do in moulding the sentiments of a people. They sit by their firesides — they are admitted into their most confidential communications. A feeling which they sanction is, on that account, much more strongly believed to be right and proper to be cherished, while one which they reprobate is, even if still indulged in, thought to be of a questionable nature. . . .

"It is then of cardinal importance to the peace and welfare of the country, that there should be a reunion of the different religious denominations which now have distinct organizations at the North and the South. But I believe it to be perfectly evident that, if this is to take place, it must begin with the Episcopal Church. If that cannot, or will not, reunite, none can or will. We separated from the force of outward circumstances, without discord, without crimination or recrimination; on the contrary, with the language of love on our lips, and, I trust and believe, with the feeling of love in our hearts. . . .

"I conceive, therefore, that the best hopes of the country, and especially of the South, are bound up in the question, what will the Episcopal Church now do? My earnest desire, then, and constant prayer, is, that the Church may be restored again in the unity of its government, and the unfeigned love of its members. And yet I cannot conceal from myself, that even this blessing, much as it is to be desired, earnestly as it is to be sought after, may be bought at too great a price. The price would be too great, if, to obtain it, we were required to violate conscience, to deny what we believe to be true, or to express repentance for what we do not see to be evil. The assurances, however, which I have received from a number of friends at the North, lead me to believe that the great body of the Church there desire nothing of the sort. . . . And let me add, that what is right to be done on this mighty subject, it is right should be done quickly. The interests are too

momentous to be left to the hazards and uncertainties of time. May God give us wisdom and understanding and faithful hearts to see our duty and to follow it! And at the same time it is our duty, as it is, I am sure, our wish, in all we do on this subject, to consult, and, as far as possible, cooperate with, the other Dioceses of the Church in the Confederate States."

The laymen and the clergy of North Carolina had come to feel great confidence in the wisdom of their Bishop; and that he always appealed to their reason and conscience, and never wished to carry any measure by the weight of his very great personal influence, gave all the greater force to his personal feelings and wishes. They probably felt as did the large majority of other Churchmen in the South, and would have preferred some delay, and united action by all the associated Dioceses. But they had usually followed his advice in great and critical matters; he had never led them wrong; and they followed him now. There was, however, a minority against him, apparently not numerous, but strong in intelligence and in character. Some indication of this feeling is seen in the fact that the Rev. Alfred A. Watson, one of the noblest men in the Church, Northern by birth, a most distinguished chaplain in the Confederate army, subsequently chairman of the Committee on Canons in the House of Deputies, and then the first Bishop of East Carolina, moved in the Council that a committee be appointed to whom should be referred so much of the Bishop's address as related to the reunion of the Dioceses; and

when that had been adopted, moved further, "*That this committee be appointed by election.*" This was a distinct intimation that the Council should oppose the course recommended by the Bishop, and that it should make sure of a committee who would report to that effect. Thus understood the resolution was rejected, and then the Bishop showed his quality by naming the Rev. Mr. Watson second on the committee composed of some of the most eminent members of the Council: the Rev. Richard S. Mason, D.D., the Rev. Alfred A. Watson, the Rev. Jos. Blount Cheshire, D.D., the Rev. William Hodges, D.D., Hon. William H. Battle, Hon. William M. Shipp, and Mr. Richard H. Smith.

Six of the seven members of this committee joined in a report declaring the strong desire of the Diocese to maintain the unity of the Church within the United States, with their gratification at hearing the sentiments expressed by the Bishop in regard to reunion; and gratefully acknowledging the kindly overtures made to the Southern Dioceses by the Presiding Bishop. They submitted two resolutions for action:

"*Resolved*, That the Diocese of North Carolina is prepared to resume her position as a Diocese in connection with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, whenever, in the judgment of the Bishop, after consultation with the Bishops of the other Southern Dioceses (which consultation he is hereby requested to hold), it shall be consistent with the good faith which she owes to the Dioceses

with which she has been in union during the last four years.

"*Resolved*, That, with a view to such contingency, there be four clerical and four lay deputies elected, to represent this Diocese in the ensuing General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States." [1]

The Rev. Mr. Watson, the only man of Northern birth on the committee, submitted a minority report providing, in substance, that if all the Southern Dioceses should authorize their Bishops to act for them, and if a majority of these Bishops should deem it right and advisable to reunite with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, "it shall be competent to the [said] Bishops to take all the steps necessary to effect or complete such reunion, so far as the Diocese of North Carolina is concerned." This was indeed a strange and impracticable proposition, but it served at least to define the issue. It was rejected by a decisive majority, as was also another series of resolutions, introduced by Mr. Edward J. Hale, referring the whole subject to the General Council appointed to be held in Mobile, November 8. Both resolutions reported by the majority were then adopted; and the following deputies were elected in pursuance of the second resolution: of the clergy, the Rev. Drs. Richard S. Mason, Joseph B. Cheshire, Fordyce M. Hubbard, and William Hodges; and of the laity, the Hon. William

[1] Deputies were also elected to represent the Diocese in the "General Council" to be held in Augusta, in November.

H. Battle, Messrs. Richard H. Smith, Kemp P. Battle, and Robert Strange.

The resolutions of the Diocese of North Carolina are almost identical with those of the Diocese of Georgia. Both express an earnest desire for the reunion of the separated Dioceses, so soon as might be consistent with their honorable obligations; and both refer it to the Bishop to determine when that time shall have come. Both also provide for the representation of the Diocese in the approaching General Convention at Philadelphia, "in view of such contingency." But there was this very radical difference in the effect of the action of the two Dioceses: the Bishop of Georgia was openly and peremptorily opposed to going back to the General Convention, until the meeting of the General Council had enabled the Southern Dioceses to confer together, and to agree upon terms of reunion, which the General Convention should be called upon to accept. This being the case, it was perfectly certain that the action of the Diocesan Council of Georgia had not at all advanced the cause of immediate reunion. On the other hand, Bishop Atkinson was declaredly in favor of having the Southern Dioceses represented in the coming General Convention, and trusting to the vital power of Christian fellowship to secure appropriate action by the Convention, and not standing apart in an attitude of suspicion until such action had been taken. He was no more willing than Bishop Elliott to give up any principle, or to agree to any unworthy concession,

but he believed that when brethren looked each other in the face, and felt the love of brethren in their hearts, they would not be long in adjusting any difficult questions which might arise. This was Bishop Atkinson's known attitude; and the action of his Diocesan Council, in electing deputies to the General Convention, and leaving it for him to say when they should take their places in that body, was felt to be *the first great step taken towards speedy reunion.*

The Council of the Diocese of Virginia met in St. Paul's Church, Richmond, September 30; and in all his long and faithful service Bishop Johns never showed to better advantage than in his address to that body. He felt clear of any taint of schism in thought or purpose; he felt no doubt of the propriety of any action by him or his Diocese in connection with the War; but he saw the dangers which beset the path of a perpetuated division. His own good heart could trust the hearts of his Northern brethren. He had been deeply moved by the appeal of the Presiding Bishop, and by letters and messages of affection from others of the North, in some cases from those furthest removed from him in former associations and in theological sympathies. With simple yet lofty magnanimity, sadly rare even in the best men, he had gratefully acknowledged, and gratefully declined, offers of pecuniary assistance for his impoverished Diocese and clergy; saying, with simple dignity and unconscious heroism, that it would be better for his people by self-denial and mutual helpfulness to bear their own

burdens, rather than to become a burden upon others.[1]

But these things had touched his heart, and had satisfied him that the Church in the South had nothing to fear in taking that course to which his feelings impelled him. He was an eloquent man, and had a singularly clear view of true ethical principles and of their application to Christian conduct. He put before his Council with great persuasive force the duty of terminating at once the separation which had been caused by the unhappy exigencies of a state of war. Bishop Atkinson had spoken with the power of a Christian patriot and Catholic Bishop. Bishop Johns, a sound and subtle casuist, in the best sense of the words, spoke with the searching discrimination of a wise and loving pastor, detecting and exposing the cunning deceits of the human heart. Beginning with the general agreement that ultimate reunion was to be desired, he exposed the weakness of the plea for postponing action:

"If, as a people, we are solicitous for a speedy civil reunion, why should we not, as a Church, be equally desirous of a speedy reestablishment of our ecclesiastical relations?

[1] This was in response to the generous offer of the Bishop of New York. A similar proposition from the Board of Missions the Bishop laid before the Council. The Council adopted the following:

"*Resolved by the Council of the Diocese of Virginia*, That while we do not feel at liberty to accept their offer (tender of funds) we acknowledge it with gratification, and return our thanks to the Domestic Committee for the fraternal spirit and liberal disposition manifested in their action."

"Are there any sensibilities which may be disregarded in the one adjustment, but which require to be consulted and indulged in the other?

"May we be more implacable as Churchmen than as citizens?

"If time is necessary to compose our feelings, how much must be taken? Whose experience is to determine the measure? Is there any other scriptural limit than the 'going down of the sun'?

"Are not such feelings better disciplined by immediate, resolute mortification than by indulgent allowance?

. . . . . .

"Would it not be more becoming in us to assume that those with whom we are willing to be reunited will do what is right without being held to it by a pledge, especially as the doing what we desire would be compatible with their principles; but a pledge to that effect would involve a recognition irreconcilable with their known convictions of ecclesiastical order, and which therefore, as they cannot consistently give, we ought not to propose?

. . . . . .

"Is not resumption of former relations, without concessions or promises, the only way in which reunion is practicable, and would it not furnish surer hope of a peaceful and profitable future than any formal concordat attained by diplomatic negotiation?

. . . . . .

"If the endeavor to present a correct view of our

position and of the policy which it suggests, reveals the inclination it has given to my own judgment, it has but done what I have no desire to avoid. I trust it has been effected without even the appearance of presumption, or a word that would produce any other excitement than such as is inseparable from a subject of paramount interest. . . . The tempest might readily be reproduced by a simple recital of wrong and suffering which have been endured. These, indeed, may not soon or easily be forgotten, nor is this required, but they may and must be forgiven. . . . Christians are to be peacemakers. Their heaven-descended motto is, 'On earth peace, good will toward men.' In 'following after the things which make for peace,' as they are commanded, they care not to calculate how long wounded sensibilities may be expected to weep, or memory be allowed to eliminate their wrongs. The proffered hand may be accepted before the lacerations it has inflicted are healed, or often it would be impossible to do so at all, for there are lacerations which the heart cannot cease to feel till it ceases to beat. We are to be imitators of Him Who, 'whilst we were sinners' died for us; Who when pierced in every limb, prayed for the forgiveness of His persecutors whilst they were rending Him in their rage. 'Even as Christ forgave you, *so* do ye,' is the rule and measure for His followers. And with this pattern of prompt and unsolicited forgiveness of complicated violence and wrong, infinitely surpassing all that man can experience from his fellow-man, it would ill become

those who profess and call themselves Christians to nourish resentment by dwelling upon injuries, or to plead sorrow, which it is proper to feel, in delay of reconciliation, which it would be wrong to defer, — a plea which, if it is allowed, may be in force for life, and adjourn reunion for the consideration of a generation unborn."

So much of the Bishop's address as referred to the reunion of the Dioceses was referred to a distinguished committee, and after some debate a series of resolutions was adopted, cordially approving the course of the Bishop, in his correspondence with the presiding Bishop of the Church in the United States and others upon the subject, expressing the desire of the Council to respond cordially to every sentiment of fraternal regard conveyed to them by the Bishop, but wholly unresponsive to the Bishop's eloquent appeal for immediate reunion. That whole matter was referred to the General Council of the Church in the Confederate States, to meet in Augusta on the second Wednesday of the following November.

Though the formal action of the Council, as recorded in the Journal, was entirely non-commital, and no allusion was made to the urgent appeal of the Bishop, the ineffectiveness at the time of the Bishop's earnest words is not mere matter of inference from the silence of the record. Bishop Johns commanded in a high degree the love and confidence of his Diocese, but in this matter he could not carry them with him. There was a strong sentiment in the Council earnestly op-

posed to his views and to his hopes. There were some, it cannot now be known how many, who anticipated, and ardently desired, the perpetuation of an independent Southern Church. By one speaker at least the position taken by Bishop Wilmer and Bishop Green was strongly commended; and the hope was indulged that those Dioceses which had seemed favorable to reunion might be won back by the influence of those which should stand for permanent separation.[1] It is probable that this was a fleeting sentiment only, not representing any fixed purpose or definite policy, but merely an instinctive impulse to hold on to a fair but vanishing image, an ideal consecrated by the sufferings and sacrifices of the preceding four years of struggle and of hope. Strong and earnest natures sometimes find it a difficult task to adjust themselves readily to the changing demands of even duty and necessity.

Of the Bishops only the Bishop of South Carolina seems to have continued to cherish the scheme of a permanently separate organization. His Pastoral, presently to be quoted, belongs to this period. In his thought this scheme had a definite purpose, and his sentiment was associated with serious convictions of truth, and a distinct, though elusive, hope. The impoverished and desolated state of his Diocese made it impossible to assemble his clergy and people in a Diocesan Council. He therefore addressed them in a

[1] One speaker said: "A bold course by this Council today would induce Texas to come back, and the Bishop of Georgia would never go out."

Pastoral letter, dated October 5, 1865. He set before them the situation of the Church, and opened to them his hopes and his fears. He says in part:

"No sound mind can suppose that the separation of the Southern from the Northern Church, under the influence of the political revolution which has passed over the country, can be schismatical. . . . There had been therefore no schism. The Southern Church is now rightly constituted, and is an independent and integral branch of the Church Catholic. As such she can, of right, shape her own course. She is, also, free to return to her union with the Church at the North. Which shall she do? This is the great proposition. In determining it, brethren, we should look deeply into ourselves. Unchristian sentiments may prove as injurious as false petitions. Let us make the severe mental effort of severing ourselves from all feelings and purposes not purely Christian. Let no fanaticism of independence disturb the spirit of Catholic concord and union; nor any want of Christian courage diminish our supreme regard for purity and truth. To plant ourselves on the true basis is our lofty purpose. The Church is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner stone. To this we will strive to adhere.

"We cannot but perceive that the age is political and secular in its tendencies. Its ruling powers are those of combination. This secures dominion, but is dangerous to truth. We must think, too, that a territory so immense, with a population so heterogeneous

and discordant, as that comprehended between the Atlantic and Pacific, the Lakes and the Rio Grande, is too much for any one Church. Our Southern country is limited, homogeneous, and not given to speculations. Does it not appear then that here is our surest foundation for peace and truth?

"I declare to you, brethren, my strong desire is, that, under the mercy and guiding providence of God, the Southern Church may be enabled to maintain her present independent and Catholic position. This I will seek, and to this give my best efforts. But should this be otherwise ordered by counsels stronger than our own, let the motto of the Diocese of South Carolina ever be:

A CHURCH DIVINE, NOT HUMAN;
A GOSPEL PURE AND PERFECT."

Bishop Davis alludes to the subject again in his address to his Council of February 14, 1866: "I had hoped that it might be the will of our God that we should have an independent, united, self-sustaining Southern Church. To such hope my sympathies and affections strongly clung; I thought I could see, too, a purer atmosphere for faith; this I signified to you in a late Pastoral letter."

Bishop Davis was a man of singular purity, elevation of character, and spiritual *intensity*. He was one of the best examples of a type of old-fashioned Evangelical, with perhaps a mild infusion of Calvanism, after the manner of John Newton and Cowper, a little toned up in churchmanship by the early influence of

Bishop Ravenscroft, and by his years of service under Bishop Ives. He was naturally inclined to introspection, a tendency probably strengthened by the gradual failure, and final total loss, of his eyesight. He seems to have been much depressed at this time by the changes which he saw coming over the world and over the Church. He had dreamed a beautiful dream of a Southern Church, in which the simplicity and piety of an earlier age might be renewed, and in which modern doubt and restlessness and innovation should be unknown: "I thought I could see *a purer atmosphere for faith.*" There was no element of bitterness or of ill-will to any in his thought. As in 1861 he had put forth the most acute and philosophical argument to support his theory of separation, so now he alone seems to have had some definite and noble aspiration in his fleeting hope of an independent Southern Church; not of a Church divided from the communion and fellowship of his Northern brethren, but a separate legislative and administrative branch of the One Catholic Church, to be the first real Province, and so to be the beginning of a reorganization, of the Church in the United States, demanded by the immense extent of our territory, the variety of our population, and the multiplicity of our interests. This seems to have been the idea dimly showing itself to the anxious mind of the saintly blind Bishop.[1]

[1] There was nothing of temper or self-will in Bishop Davis's desire for this separate Southern Church. Those who knew him did not need to have any proof of this; to those who did not know him

The net result then of all these meetings and discussions was, that, of the Dioceses still in doubt, North Carolina alone, and its Bishop, were committed to the policy of immediate reunion, subject to the judgment of the Bishop, after consultation with his Episcopal brethren of the South. Bishop Atkinson felt that to stand apart, and to demand terms, and to impose conditions, whether by the one party or the other, would, in the then sensitive state of the public mind, be to insure incalculable strife, dissension, and ill-feeling. On the other hand he felt that, face to face with his brethren, it would be possible to ignore difficulties, and to find a solid foundation for mutual agreement in the development of mutual good-will and personal affection and confidence. This relationship being established, a way would certainly be found to compose all matters of difference necessary to be arranged, which were few indeed; and all matters of difference, not demanding adjustment, would instinctively be avoided in the satisfaction of renewed fraternal communion. In the old established Dioceses on the Atlantic Coast it was not to be expected that such instantaneous transition could be effected, back

his ready compliance with the demands of the situation was ample proof. He said to his Council, February 14, 1866: "God has otherwise determined: we will follow the Divine determination. It is enough for the Christian to know what the Divine will is. . . . Let us rise up to our new responsibility, not sluggishly, reluctantly, or opposingly, but with clear judgments, the spirit of alacrity, and Christian confidence. I advise the immediate return of the Diocese into union with the Church in the United States."

and forth, as seemed to have taken place in the new and scarcely organized Diocese of Texas. And, moreover, Bishop Atkinson most thoroughly repudiated the theory of ecclesiastical law upon which the Bishop and Diocese of Texas had acted. He felt that if the Southern Dioceses returned, they must do so by their voluntary action, and not by some automatic effect of a political change. And he had, against much popular feeling, secured such action by his Diocesan Council as enabled him to pursue that course which he believed to be right in principle and prudent in policy.

Thus trusting in the Christian affection and courtesy of his brethren, it must have been with great satisfaction and with renewed confidence that he read in the public press the report of the Diocesan Convention of New York, which met September 27. In his address to that Convention, Bishop Horatio Potter thus refers to the anticipated presence of representatives of the Southern Church at the sessions of the approaching General Convention: "It will be a reunion that will arouse the tenderest sensibilities of every Christian heart. It will show that old affections have been restrained, not extinguished, and that feelings long pent up claim a more than ordinary indulgence in demonstrations of love, respect, and sympathy. I verily believe, as I do most fervently hope and pray, that not one word of reproach or bitterness will be heard, not one look of coldness appear, to mar the dignity and loveliness of the touching scene. In that much

longed-for welcome hour we shall need no declaration of principles, no formal vindication of the peaceful character of the Christian ministry. Divine Providence has spoken. Any words that we can use in reference to the past, whether persons or things, will be mere impertinence, adding nothing to the lessons that come to us from above, and only tending to change celestial harmonies into the miserable, discordant sounds of earth-born passion." In response to this appeal the following action was recorded:

"*Resolved*, That the Convention cordially respond to the sentiments of the Bishop respecting the return of peace to our land, and the treatment of our Southern brethren in view of this contingency."

It happened that the Rev. Dr. Quintard, late chaplain in the Confederate army, and at this time Bishop-elect of Tennessee, was in the city of New York, and being presented to the Convention met a most cordial reception, as an illustration of the sentiments expressed in their resolution spread upon the record.

It has been mentioned that Bishop Elliott had summoned the Southern Bishops to meet for mutual counsel and advice in Augusta on the 27th of September. The Diocesan Council of North Carolina probably had this meeting in mind, as affording Bishop Atkinson a convenient opportunity of conferring with the other Bishops. But shortly after the adjournment of his Council, Bishop Atkinson received notice from Bishop Elliott that the proposed meeting would not be held,

on account of the difficulty and expense of travel. It had been ascertained that the Bishops could not be gotten together. Bishop Atkinson himself was at this time quite unwell, and his health was a source of some anxiety to his family and Diocese. It is quite probable that he had already found himself unable to attempt a journey to Augusta.

Thus it seemed impossible to comply with the condition expressed in the resolution authorizing the diocesan representation in the General Convention, and all the fair hopes based thereon seemed in a moment blasted. But Bishop Atkinson knew that, while it had been the desire of his Council, as it had been his own desire and suggestion, that all kindly respect should be shown to their Southern brethren, the issue in the Council had been, *whether or not the Diocese should be represented in the General Convention;* and the Council had accepted his interpretation of the significance and gravity of the crisis, and had decided that it should be so represented. It had not been understood that the condition expressed could make such representation impossible. He felt that to allow this would be to disappoint the expectation of his people who had trusted him; and he believed that it threatened infinite damage to the best interests of the Church and of the country. He therefore determined that he would proceed to Philadelphia, so that he might be prepared to act as the necessity of the situation should seem to demand; and he called upon his clerical and lay deputies to meet him in Philadelphia at

the time of the opening of the General Convention, October 4. He had not fully determined upon his course; he would be guided by the development of the situation.

The opening of this Convention, as it relates to our subject, may be given in the words of an eye-witness, the Rev. John Henry Hopkins, Jr., in the Life of his Father:

"On the morning of the first Wednesday in October that year, as I was going up the southern flight of stone steps to the porch of St. Luke's Church, Philadelphia, to attend the opening of the General Convention, I saw, leaning against the iron railing at the half-way landing, the beloved Bishop Atkinson, of North Carolina, and round him a group of clergy and laity, welcoming him most cordially. He was the first Southern Bishop I had seen since the war began; and while joining my congratulations to those of the others, my father came up the steps, and I had the delight of witnessing the greeting between the two, when both their hearts seemed too full to permit of easy utterance. All united — none more strongly than my father — in urging the Bishop of North Carolina to return at once to his own place, and enter robed in the procession with his brethren. But he steadily refused; giving as his reason his delicate regard for his Southern brethren who had not come on. He was unwilling, even in appearance, to separate himself from them or act in so important a matter without them; and he therefore took his seat in the body of the church with

the congregation. But when in the midst of the service, the call was again made upon him, openly and by name, he could refuse no longer, but rose, advanced, and was welcomed at the Altar with joyful thanksgiving."

The printed journals of the General Convention do not show just what took place. They mention the presence of Bishop Atkinson, of North Carolina, at the opening service, and in noting the service on the morning of the second day, the record is: "Present as yesterday, with the addition of the Right Rev. H. C. Lay, D.D., Missionary Bishop of the South West," etc. But it cannot be discovered from the record that any unusual circumstances marked their appearance or attendance upon the sessions. As a matter of fact, although Bishop Atkinson yielded to the affectionate importunity of his brethren, and joined them in the opening service, yet he hesitated about taking his seat in the House of Bishops until he had some assurance of the disposition of the house towards his absent brethren. Bishop Lay seems to have arrived after Bishop Atkinson, and upon being pressed to resume their seats, they took Bishop Potter, of New York, into their confidence, and especially desired to be assured of the course likely to be taken in the case of the Bishop of Alabama. During the recess of the House of Bishops, Bishop Potter communicated informally with influential members of the house, and carried back to the two Bishops an invitation to take their seats, and "to trust to the honor and love of their

brethren." Such a basis of union appealed to both men, and they promptly entered the House of Bishops, and were received with most cordial expressions of joy and affection. The same day the clerical and lay deputies from North Carolina took their seats in the lower house, doubtless by the advice of the Bishop.[1] Texas and Tennessee were also represented by deputies in both orders, and the reunion of the Dioceses had in a measure been effected.

We of this day can hardly realize what a venture of faith it was for a Southern delegate to undertake that trip to Philadelphia in October, 1865. That city was thought to be one in which anti-Southern feeling had been most intense. It was in Philadelphia that the *Episcopal Recorder* had been uttering its bitterness; and some of its leading Churchmen were of national reputation and influence as leaders in all those matters in which the North and the South had been arrayed in arms against each other. And although they held fast to their trust in that Christian fellowship, which drew them on to make this venture for its preservation, they had many anxious thoughts; and we, who remained at home, looked with mingled hope and fear for the

[1] The Hon. Kemp P. Battle, late President of the University of North Carolina, was in 1865 the youngest of the lay deputies from his Diocese attending the General Convention in Philadelphia. He said to Bishop Atkinson, on the first day of the Convention, that he was satisfied, from what he had experienced and observed in personal intercourse with the members, that they might safely take their seats at once. The Bishop replied pleasantly that the enthusiasm of young men must be held in a little, — or something to that effect.

first letters which should tell us how they fared. They had acted against the judgment and the wishes of the great body of their Southern brethren. They had followed their Bishop; it was to be proven whether he had again led them aright.

There remained no more doubt after the second day of the session. On all sides they met kindly welcome and hearty greetings. Not only in the sessions of the Convention and in the general intercourse among the members, but generous citizens of Philadelphia, especially John and William Welsh, *par nobile fratrum*, made them at home in their houses, and without their knowledge paid their hotel bills, and carried them off to be their honored guests for the rest of the session, loading them with every courtesy and kindness which their generous hearts could devise.

The Rev. Dr. Hubbard, one of the deputies from North Carolina, writing from Philadelphia during the session of the Convention, to *The Church Intelligencer*, of which he was editor, says of their reception and treatment: "There was in word, in look, in act, a sincerity that could not be mistaken of joy that we were once more reunited. We felt that we were taken to their hearts again, not as reconciled after an estrangement, but simply as brethren met after long absence, brethren whose early love was unbroken, and between whom had never been suspicion or mistrust. They seem to have risen above all considerations of worldly interest, to have realized that the Kingdom of Christ is not of this world, and to have allowed no earthly

sympathy to interfere with their affection for us as brethren in Him." [1]

This exuberance of emotion and sentiment, which quite justified Bishop Potter's very sanguine anticipations, as expressed in the quotation on a previous page, was soon put to the test, and well did it stand the test. Bishop Atkinson and Bishop Lay had felt that Southern men should be present in that Convention, not merely, perhaps not chiefly, because they believed that their presence would call out the strong fraternal sympathies of their former association, but because they knew that, face to face and under the influence of mutual sympathy and respect engendered by personal contact, the few delicate matters which had to be considered and settled would be better managed than if each party, even with the best and most generous purposes, stood off and looked only at its own side of the case.

Bishop Lay's case was easily disposed of. The Convention would readily have admitted Arkansas as a Diocese, and accepted him as its Bishop, if that had been practicable in the actual condition of affairs. But the results of the war in the South West had left little or nothing of the scattered congregations which had organized as a Diocese in November, 1862; and so Bishop Lay was simply

[1] In Dr. Brand's "Life of Bishop Whittingham" is the following statement: "At a meeting of the Board of Missions, on the announcement by a member that the two Southern Bishops had that day taken their place in the House of Bishops, the *Gloria in Excelsis* was sung."

recognized in his old position as Missionary Bishop of the South West.

The case of Bishop Wilmer gave little real trouble, although his relations with the military authorities in Alabama just at that time created a good deal of prejudice in the minds of some Northern men. By a joint resolution of the two houses it was declared that he should be recognized as Bishop of Alabama, upon making the Declaration of Conformity contained in the Ordinal, and forwarding to the Presiding Bishop the proper evidence and testimonials of his Consecration. There was some discussion of the proper form of the resolution, with messages back and forth between the two houses, but no real difficulty, and, so far as appears or as is remembered, no immoderate development of sectional feeling.

The real trouble came with the introduction of resolutions for the appointment of a joint service of thanksgiving for the restoration of peace, and its accompanying blessings of restored unity. The record shows the gradual process by which elements of difference and of contention were eliminated, and a form of resolution agreed upon, in which the South as well as the North could cordially unite. And looked at with an eye of discrimination, and remembering the situation of affairs, it is a very wonderful record. It is easily accessible in the Journal of the General Convention, and so need not be gone over here, save in a brief summary of the chief points. Bishop Burgess first prepared the draft of a resolution which he showed

to Bishop Lay, who pointed out that, by including a reference to the abolition of slavery, he had made it difficult for Southern men to adopt it, whatever might be their feelings, without putting themselves into an embarrassing position. The resolutions also contained an emphatic sentence upon the reestablishment of the authority of the United States government over all the land. Upon his own request, Bishop Burgess was afterwards allowed to amend his resolutions by omitting the reference to slavery. Subsequently the whole matter was referred to a committee consisting of the five senior Bishops, thus making Bishop Hopkins chairman of the committee. This committee reported resolutions appointing a special service of thanksgiving "for God's manifold mercies to our country and His Church, especially in giving us deliverance from the late afflicting war, in reestablishing the authority of the National Government over all the land, in restoring to our country the blessings of union and concord, and in bringing back the unity of the Church as represented in this Convention." This report, with the accompanying resolution, was adopted by the House of Bishops.

During all the discussions of this question, Bishop Atkinson and Bishop Lay had absented themselves from the house. Upon the assembling of the House of Bishops in its next session, after having adopted the report and resolution of the committee just mentioned, it became known that the two Southern Bishops present felt that they could not join in the service of thanks-

giving in the terms adopted by the house; and, in order to give them an opportunity of expressing themselves and declaring their position, Bishop Odenheimer moved a reconsideration of the vote, and the question was once more before the house. The words of Bishop Lay will best describe what followed:

"All eyes were upon Bishop Atkinson, as he answered the appeal made to him. He knew that he had that to say which must needs be distasteful to men full of exultation at the Southern downfall. With no diffidence and with no temper, rather with the frankness of a child uttering his thoughts, he opened all his mind:

" 'We are asked,' said he, 'to unite with you in returning thanks for the restoration of peace and unity. The former we can say, the latter we cannot say.

" 'We are thankful for the restoration of peace. War is a great evil. It is clear to my mind that in the counsels of the All-wise, the issue of this contest was predetermined. I am thankful that the appointed end has come, and that war is exchanged for peace. But we are not thankful for the unity described in the resolution, '*reestablishing the authority of the National Government over all the land.*' We acquiesce in that result. We will accommodate ourselves to it, and will do our duty as citizens of the common Government. But we cannot say that we are thankful. We labored and prayed for a very different termination, and, if it had seemed good to our Heavenly Father, would have been very thankful for the War to result otherwise

than it has resulted. I am willing to say I am thankful for the restoration of *Peace to the country and unity to the Church.*'"

Thereupon, Bishop Stevens, of Pennsylvania, moved the following substitute for the report of the five Bishops:

"*Resolved*, That the House of Bishops, in consideration of the return of peace to the country and unity to the Church, propose to devote Tuesday, the seventeenth day of October instant, as a day of Thanksgiving and Prayer to Almighty God for these His inestimable benefits; and that an appropriate service, prepared under the direction of the Five senior Bishops, be held in St. Luke's Church.

"*Resolved*, That the Bishops affectionately request the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies to join with them in the observance and services of the proposed Thanksgiving."

An effort was made to lay these resolutions on the table, but it was defeated by the decisive vote of seven for and sixteen against the motion to table. The resolutions were then adopted, and being the same day communicated to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, that house promptly adopted the following resolution, proposed by Mr. Hunt of Western New York:

"*Resolved*, That this House, recognizing with profound gratitude the goodness of Almighty God manifested in the restoration of national peace and union, will cordially unite in the thanksgiving services appointed by the House of Bishops on Tuesday next."

There were those who felt much dissatisfaction that the restoration of the authority of the Federal government, and the abolition of slavery, were not emphasized in the appointment of this day of thanksgiving; and efforts were made once and again to inject into the action of the Convention terms which should express those ideas. We are told that political newspapers took up the matter, and in other ways outside pressure made it hard for many of the deputies to adhere to the position they had taken. But they stood nobly by their determination to sacrifice their own feelings, and to restrain their natural impulses, in order that their Southern brethren present and absent might be fully assured of their Christian love and respect. They promptly and decisively voted down every attempt made to alter the terms of the resolutions adopted, and they gave thanks to God for restored unity and love in words which might come free and warm from every heart.

Thus in spite of the weakness and perversity of human nature, and the faults of human prejudice and temper, and the opposition even of some good men both North and South, the Spirit of Christ ruled in the Body of Christ, and made men at last "to be of one mind in an house."

The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was again One, as the result of the meeting of the General Convention at Philadelphia, in October, 1865. When that Convention adjourned, it was felt that the cause of unity in the Church was safe.

There is but little to add in the story of the Church in the Confederate States. The Dioceses of the South had said in 1861 that they withdrew from the Church in the United States only because of the necessity arising out of a state of war. When the War had passed by, it proved to be even as they had said. They could not remain apart, not even when some of them thought that they wished to do so. The unity of the One Head drew the divided members together, and before they knew it they were again One.

The General Council of the Southern Church, according to the provisions of its constitution adopted in 1862, was to meet the second Wednesday in November, 1865. The place originally appointed had been Mobile, but it was changed to Augusta on account of the military order closing the Alabama churches. On the day appointed the Bishops of Georgia, Virginia, Mississippi, and Alabama met in St. Paul's Church, Augusta, with clerical and lay deputies from Virginia, Georgia, and Alabama, and clerical deputies alone from South Carolina and Mississippi. On the second day one lay deputy from South Carolina appeared. Only Virginia had a full delegation; South Carolina had only two clergymen and one layman; Alabama the same; Mississippi, one clergyman; Florida had no representative; eighteen deputies in all.

The Rev. Charles C. Pinckney was chosen President of the House of Deputies, and the Rev. John M. Mitchell, secretary. The Rev. W. H. Harrison was chosen secretary of the House of Bishops. Resolutions

were passed substituting the word "United" in the place of "Confederate," in the Prayer Book, and one or two other resolutions seeming to imply the possible continuance of one or more Dioceses in a condition of separation; and the two houses united in a dignified and manly protest against military interference with the rights of the Church in Alabama, where General Thomas's order closing the churches was still in force.

But the really significant and important action by this Council was contained in Resolutions I and V, of a series of preambles and resolutions adopted jointly by the Bishops and Deputies, as follows:

"*Resolved*, I. That in the judgment of this Council it is perfectly consistent with the good faith which she owes to the Bishops and Dioceses with which she has been in union since 1862, for any Diocese to decide for herself whether she shall any longer be in union with this Council."

V. "That whenever any Diocese shall determine to withdraw from this Ecclesiastical Confederation, such withdrawal shall be considered as duly accomplished when an official notice, signed by the Bishop and Secretary of such Diocese, shall have been given to the Bishops of the Dioceses remaining in connection with this Council."

After a session of three days the Council adjourned *sine die*, and the Church in the Confederate States had ceased to be.

The dissolution of this organization was the direct result of the Christian love and courteous consideration

manifested at the General Convention in Philadelphia. No one, after that, could really desire to perpetuate division. In the preamble to the joint resolutions of the Council at Augusta, it is recited:

"*Whereas*, the spirit of charity which prevailed in the proceedings of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, at its late session in Philadelphia, has warmly commended itself to the hearts of this Council; therefore, *Resolved*," etc., as given above. And in every Diocesan Council, as one by one they met, and took the necessary action to effect their reunion with the Church in the United States, either in the very body of the record of the change made, or in the address of the Bishop, or report of the committee recommending the change in the relation of the Diocese, mention is made of the spirit of love and unity manifested at the General Convention, in such a way that it is plain to be seen that the course of events at that General Convention was the determining factor in the problem as worked out in each Diocese. Well may it be claimed for those who attended from the South, and especially for the great-hearted and Catholic-minded Bishop of North Carolina, that they were the providential instruments through whom reunion, as it actually came about, was accomplished. To Bishop Atkinson, more than to any other one man, we owe, under God, the PEACE AND UNITY which the Church entered upon and enjoyed so immediately upon the close of the great War between the States.

One by one the Southern Dioceses met in their Diocesan Councils, and in resolutions setting forth the necessity under which they had acted in making their separate organization in 1861, and recognizing the removal of that necessity, withdrew from their temporary association, and renewed their connection with the Church in the United States. And Southern Churchmen still recall with pride, and with humble gratitude to God, the history of that brief episode. As their fathers repelled the name and the thought of schism, in connection with that Southern Church, so we believe that the true story of their conduct does abundantly show that they were fully justified in their claim to have preserved throughout its brief existence the Catholic Faith and the Catholic spirit. And we believe that the page which records the history of the "*Church in the Confederate States*" is one of the fairest and brightest pages in the history of our American Church, and of our American Christianity.

The following are the dates on which the Dioceses of "The Church in the Confederate States," not represented at Philadelphia, renewed their connection with the Church in the United States:

The Diocese of Georgia	January	3,	1866
The Diocese of Alabama	"	17,	"
The Diocese of South Carolina	February	16,	"
The Diocese of Florida	"	22,	"
The Diocese of Mississippi	May	9,	"
The Diocese of Virginia	"	16,	"

STATEMENT BY BISHOP ATKINSON AND BISHOP LAY

The following letter was sent to leading clergymen and laymen throughout the Southern Dioceses, and was published in the Church papers, upon the adjournment of the General Convention of 1865.

TO OUR BRETHREN IN THE SOUTHERN DIOCESES

In resuming our seats in the General Convention of the Church in the United States, we have taken a step in advance of those with whom we have been for some years associated. We were aware that we ventured much: but we were prepared to venture much in order to secure the reunion of the Church, and to obviate the evils which were likely to grow up in the absence of frank and personal conference.

It seems proper that we should make known to you what has happened during this memorable session.

We demanded no formal guarantees: the assembled Bishops offered us no pledge save that of "their honor and their love." As a House and as individuals they welcomed us with cordial greeting.

There has been in the House of Bishops a careful avoidance of what might give us pain. Painful things were sometimes spoken, but even then the speakers used studied moderation and self-restraint.

The results arrived at are as follows:

Bishop Lay, although he held that the erection of Arkansas into a diocese, and his election as diocesan, were valid acts, preferred to waive that question. By the calamities of war the Church in that State has been so enfeebled that it is no longer able to exhibit an organization. He therefore answered to his name, and was received by the House, as Missionary Bishop of the Southwest.

In the matter of Bishop Wilmer, no official documents were before the Convention, and the case was complicated by an unhappy conflict between the military and the ecclesiastical authorities in the State of Alabama. And yet, after elaborate discussion, his consecration was ratified on conditions not liable to objection, unanimously in the House of Bishops, and with only one negative vote in the House of Deputies, which vote was subsequently withdrawn.

The Bishop-elect of Tennessee was accepted with great unanimity, and consecrated without delay to his high office.

In celebrating a thanksgiving, the Convention abstained from disputed topics, and confined its expression of gratitude to the mercies which we recognize in common, viz., peace in the country and unity in the Church.

In devising measures to provide relief for sufferers in the South, the action of the Church was marked by sympathy and delicacy.

In establishing a system for the instruction of the

freedmen, our advice was sought, and Episcopal authority duly respected.

In general, while the Bishops and other members of the Convention have in no wise denied or concealed their sentiments on the questions political and social brought by the war to a practical solution, they have not required of us any expression of opinion on these topics. They have carefully discriminated between the political and the ecclesiastical aspects of these questions, and have confined their expressed judgments and their action to the latter. They are content with the assurance that we render for conscience' sake, allegiance honest and sincere, to the Government of the United States, and will teach others so to do.

We see nothing now to hinder the renewal of the relations formerly existing in the Church.

We feel bound to acknowledge that we have been greatly indebted to many of the Bishops for the warm fraternal feeling manifested by them, and for their generous exposure of themselves to censure because of their efforts to promote peace and unity; nor ought we to withold our conviction that the great body of the House of Deputies have deserved well of the Church, because of the manliness with which they have encountered reproach, and perhaps subjected themselves to suffering, in the cause of peace and holy moderation.

In conclusion, we desire to record our deep conviction and our reverent acknowledgement that the results now related are the doing, not of man but of God.

Our profound gratitude is due to Him Who, as we trust, in this perilous juncture, has interposed effectually to heal the divisions of the Church, and to calm the passions which threatened to rend it asunder.

THOMAS ATKINSON,
Bishop of North Carolina.
HENRY C. LAY,
Missionary Bishop of the Southwest.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS,
PHILADELPHIA, October 20, 1865.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS,
PHILADELPHIA, October 20, 1865.

In all the statements and conclusions of the Bishops of North Carolina and the Southwest I most heartily concur; and with them desire to record my deep conviction that the results related are the doing, not of man but of God.

CHARLES TODD QUINTARD,
Bishop of Tennessee.

BISHOP ATKINSON AND THE CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERACY[1]

The third Bishop of North Carolina occupied a somewhat unique position among our Southern Bishops in his attitude towards the difficult problems presented to the Church, both at the beginning and at the close of the War between the States. His position was not always understood, nor did his course at the time command universal approval. But it was his power of seeing clearly, and of reasoning accurately, amid the clouds and clamor of those perilous times, which, more than any other single influence, brought the Church in peace and unity and unfeigned charity through trials which otherwise might have split it into discordant and hostile communions. Having truth with him, he dared to seem to stand alone; and all the more contentedly and patiently, because his love and confidence towards his brethren made him feel sure that the truth would in the end bring all together again in pursuit of their great and holy purpose.

It has long been my deliberate judgment that in his wonderful combination of spiritual elevation, moral earnestness, intellectual power, and sound

[1] This is, in substance, an address delivered at the laying of the corner-stone of the Church of the Holy Comforter, the "ATKINSON MEMORIAL," in Charlotte, N. C.

judgment, Bishop Atkinson was the greatest man I have ever known. He was like a little child in purity of character, in perfect sincerity and unaffectedness. He did not condescend to the lowly, because his generous love and genuine sympathy saw all men on the level of a redeemed humanity. He was the kindest and most charming of companions, with a sweet and gentle humor, which insensibly reconciled and harmonized the possible discordances and incongruities of the most heterogeneous gathering; and yet there was ever about him an atmosphere of unaffected and unconscious goodness and purity, which seemed to make a base thought or an unlovely word unthinkable and unspeakable in his presence. As a preacher he perfectly illustrated that definition of eloquence which makes it consist in convincing the mind and moving the heart, rather than in pleasing the taste; which makes the hearer say to himself, "How true, and how just!" rather than "How beautiful," or "How eloquent!" Absorbed in the greatness of his message, and in the solemn responsibility of delivering it, he would have scorned the artificial graces of oratory, if he had thought at all about them. It never once entered his mind that he was preaching an eloquent sermon. I have never forgotten the impression made upon me when I was about fourteen years old, and had, with a familiarity which his affectionate treatment of me allowed, repeated to him what a rather shallow clergyman had said about the neglect of the cultivation of oratory by our clergy, as compared with some other ministers.

Up to that time I had heard little preaching except that of my own father, and of the Bishop himself; and I had a rather high opinion of the quality of preaching in the Church. I confidently expected to hear the Bishop repel the suggestion that our clergy were in any respect behind those of our Christian brethren about us. He looked at me for a moment in silence, with his accustomed expression of serious benignity, and then said: "My son, oratory is the last thing I wish to see my clergy cultivate." I did not understand him then, but it seems to me now a speech most characteristic of the man, and of the preacher. To him the great things in preaching were so very great and absorbing that he never got down to the level of a cultivated and conscious oratory. And therein lay his excellence as a speaker, and that real eloquence, where power of thought and earnestness of purpose were, by the heat of unaffected love, fused into a living word, which went straight to the heart and mind with the irresistible force of an electric shock. To me he was the most impressive and convincing preacher I have ever listened to, and the most simple and unaffected in his method and in his manner.

I can not refrain from giving here two interesting experiences, told me by Bishop Atkinson himself, which I have never seen in print, or heard from others. His first charge was in Norfolk, his second in Lynchburg. He had been born, baptized, and brought up in the Church, as had his ancestors before him. He was of an old Virginia Church family, though several

of his brothers and sisters became Presbyterians early in their life. In his youth the Church in Virginia, as in most other parts of the country, was but beginning to learn the significance and the value of her own standards of doctrine and of worship. The clergy had been so few, and so overburdened with the care of widely scattered congregations and individuals, that they had not been able to put into use the devotional methods of the Church; and many of her holy and edifying services had been neglected and forgotten. But the spirit was moving upon the dry bones, and clergy and people were beginning to understand, as well as to love, their spiritual mother, and more and more to recover their lost heritage, lost to use, but preserved for them in the Prayer Book.

The young rector at Lynchburg, in his diligent study of the Prayer Book, observing with renewed attention its various contents, began to think for the first time about the Collects, Epistles and Gospels for the Saints' Days and other minor festivals. He had never seen them used, and he wondered why they were there, in the very midst of the book, and closely associated with those in common use. And then he began to feel that they must be there because the Church intended them for use. This seemed a strange and startling thought, but he could see no other explanation. He did not lack courage to act alone, but he had modesty and humility, which made him fear to set himself up as wiser or better than his brethren. He felt that he must seek counsel.

It was in those days a long journey from Lynchburg to Petersburg, in the heavy stage coach, or by private conveyance, along the ill-made and worse-kept roads of mountain and of low country. But this question had to be settled; and so he took that journey to confer with a kindred spirit, the Rev. Nicholas Cobbs, rector of St. Paul's Church, and afterwards the first Bishop of Alabama, a "Saint of the Southern Church," as he has justly been called. It came out in their conference that the same thoughts had been exercising the mind and conscience of good brother Cobbs, and he had come to the same conclusion. So, then and there, these two agreed that from that time on they would endeavor to observe the days and seasons of the Church's year, as they are set forth in the Prayer Book. And that, Bishop Atkinson said to me, was the beginning of the observance of these minor festivals in Virginia, so far as he knew and believed.

The second experience which he related to me brings us a little nearer to our subject. When the Diocese of Indiana, in 1843, came to elect its first Diocesan Bishop, the choice fell on the Rev. Thomas Atkinson, rector of St. Peter's Church, Baltimore. At this time he had been only seven years in the ministry, and had come in from the Bar, without the advantage of a course in a theological seminary. He promptly declined, his *Nolo Episcopari* being the simple expression of his sense of his unpreparedness. The Diocese of Indiana then chose another for Bishop, who also declined. Thereupon Indiana in 1846 again called him.

This second election seemed to carry with it a strong presumption of a providential call to that work, and his mind was adjusting itself to what seemed an inevitable duty, when he received a letter from an old Lynchburg friend, who for some years had been living in Indiana. This friend had left Virginia because his intense dislike of slavery had made him unwilling any longer to live in contact with it. Bishop Atkinson himself had a strong sense of the disadvantages and evils of slavery, though he was also sensible of the difficulty of finding any just and practicable means of abolishing it in the South. He had freed all his own slaves who wished to be freed and to go to the free States, and had kept only those who voluntarily chose to remain in the South. His old friend wrote expressing the pleasure he anticipated in seeing him Bishop of Indiana, and begged him to bring his family to his house, and to make that house his home, until he should have leisure to make his permanent arrangements. He then added, that the Bishop must be prepared to live and work in a community where the feeling against slavery and slave owners was becoming so inflamed and bitter, that the writer of the letter as a Southern man, though opposed to slavery, found himself in a painful and embarrassing position.

This letter caused him to decline for a second time the call of Indiana. Little as he was attached to the institution of slavery, and thankful as he could have been to see it justly and peacefully abolished, he felt quite sure that, if in Indiana his friend could not live

in comfort on account of the state of public feeling, he could not hope to be happy and contented in his work, since he would probably, as time went on, find himself more and more out of sympathy with his people on the great and absorbing question of the day.

In the year 1853 the Diocese of South Carolina was to elect a Bishop. There was a strong feeling in favor of electing the Rev. Dr. Atkinson. But rumors had reached that State as to his feeling about slavery, and prominent persons in that Diocese communicated with him, asking for an expression of his views on the subject. He replied promptly in effect that he felt slavery to be a disadvantage, though he could not see how to get rid of it. But he declared that if it came to a choice between slavery and the Union, he should say, let slavery go, and preserve the Union of the States. That is, as I remember, the substance of his reply. This letter, he said, prevented his being elected Bishop of South Carolina; and Bishop Davis was chosen. My old friend and parishioner, Gen. Thomas F. Drayton, told me that he was a member of the South Carolina Diocesan Convention of 1853, and well remembered the letter of Bishop Atkinson, which was made known to the members of the Convention, he himself having seen and read it; and, he said, but for that letter Bishop Atkinson would certainly have been their choice for Bishop.

"So," Bishop Atkinson said to me, "I was not Bishop of Indiana, because I was not sufficiently opposed to

slavery; and I was not Bishop of South Carolina, because I was not sufficiently in favor of it."

And that is an example of how he went, not with one party or with the other; but thought his own straight clear thought, and spoke out his own honest words, and acted upon his own solid convictions; modest and quiet and gentle, but absolutely fixed and immovable in loyalty to his conscience and to his judgment.

Bishop Ives left the Diocese in the fall of 1852. In May, 1853, Bishop Atkinson was chosen by the Diocesan Convention to be his successor, and was consecrated October 17 following, in St. John's Chapel, New York.

The American Church has had few, if any, greater Bishops than Bishop Atkinson, in all the qualities of pure, strong, elevated, refined, and consecrated Christian manhood; and it has had no Bishop more admirably fitted by divine providence in personal gifts and qualifications for the peculiar demands of the field specially committed to him.

Bishop Ives had begun his work in North Carolina upon the old High-Anglican principles of Ravenscroft and Hobart, and had powerfully quickened and popularized the work of his great predecessor in the Diocese. In the latter years of his administration he had been led astray by the mediæval element in the Oxford Movement, as so many of the English clergy were. In the hesitating counsels and inconsistent action of Bishop Ives's later years the Diocese had in a measure found its advantage, for never did so able a man exert

so little influence over a people who had been devoted to him. But while none of his people followed him, there was very great danger that his defection would discredit the sound principles of his earlier years, and drive the Church from the course laid out for it by the great Ravenscroft. It was so easy for the thoughtless and ignorant to say: "Such were the principles of the Church; and see the result!" And personality is so much stronger than reason that it is hard to meet such a form of attack.

But at the head of the Diocese, in the vacant place, another great and strong personality is seen. A broader character and a more capacious intelligence than Ravenscroft's, yet with all of Ravenscroft's immovable weight of principle and of loyalty to the Church; a sounder judgment, a more accurate discrimination, a more serene and lofty spirit, than was found in Ives, yet with a logical power, a moral sincerity, and a spiritual force in the pulpit, which commanded respect and attention, at least equal, if not in the end superior, to the best effects of his predecessors best oratory; — all this made the third Bishop of North Carolina a man raised up by God for the emergency, and specially fitted for the necessities of that critical time. His very appearance inspired confidence, and every earnest and loving word strengthened the effect of his noble presence. Never had a Diocese of our American Church suffered such a calamity as seemed all but to overwhelm us in the defection of our eloquent and beloved Bishop. Yet in an instant perfect confidence

was restored, and hope revived, and the life of the Diocese went forward, under the influence of a calm, earnest, clear-headed, single-hearted leader, in whom all recognized a man called of God to be an Apostle in His Church.

And so, throughout the trials and perplexities of war, and the overturning of established order, and the subversion of civil and ecclesiastical institutions and precedents, we find in him the same unperturbed spirit, the same serene, unruffled temper, the same clear thoughts, the same loyalty to well-considered principles, and the same safe and solid judgment. In the crisis produced by the secession of the Southern States and the outbreak of war, violently rending the country in twain, and separating the Southern Dioceses from those in the North, he seems to have stood alone among the Southern Bishops in his clear and accurate views as to the *status* of the Dioceses thus actually isolated. In that still more critical moment, after the war was at an end, he again stood alone in the policy which guided his Diocese.

The view of the other Southern Bishops came practically to this — that the secession of a State from the Union was *ipso facto* the separation of the Diocese from the Church in the United States; that, having ceased to be citizens of the United States, they could no longer as individuals or as Dioceses be connected with the Church in the United States, but were at once separated from it, without any action of their own, and freed from the obligations of its Constitution and

Canons. Bishop Atkinson denied this. While granting that the separation produced by civil and political action might justify, and even require, a separate organization for the Church in the South, he maintained that the mere action of the States could have no effect whatever *ipso facto* upon the unity of the Church; and consequently that, until the Southern Dioceses should as such take action, they were still part of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. This position he put forth and argued with great force in his Convention addresses, at Morganton in 1861, and at Chapel Hill in 1862.

This view of the question was not popular in the South. Inflamed with all the passions engendered by civil strife, the members of the Church, being in large proportion leaders of public sentiment, and identified with the Southern cause, chafed at the idea of any connection with the invading enemy. Bishop Polk, of Louisiana, in an address to his Diocese, maintained in its fullest extent the view reprobated by Bishop Atkinson; and declared that by the secession of the State of Louisiana, *ipso facto*, the Diocese of Louisiana was separated from the Church in the United States, and stood isolated, without organic connection with any other Church or Diocese. Bishop Elliott, of Georgia, declared that by the secession of the Southern States the Southern Bishops had ceased to be Bishops of the United States, apparently meaning that by necessary inference they had ceased to be Bishops of the Church in the United States. And

this seemed to be the general attitude of the Southern Bishops.

As the state of the country did in fact make a separation, and a cessation of all ordinary intercourse and communication, and as Bishop Atkinson recognized the necessity of withdrawing from the Church in the United States, and forming an organization conterminous with the bounds of the Confederacy, the distinction between his position and that of other Southern Bishops may seem merely *doctrinaire*. But it shows how carefully and clearly he thought out his position, and how faithfully he stood by his convictions. And this clear-sightedness into essential principles gave him a courage in action, and a moral weight which was of vast moment in the end.

In the meantime his view was proved to be not merely *doctrinaire* by two occurrences which subjected him for the time to serious misrepresentation and distress. Some time in 1861, after North Carolina had seceded, he received the canonical notice of the election of the Rev. Wm. Bacon Stevens, as Assistant Bishop of Pennsylvania. As the Diocese of North Carolina had as yet taken no action towards changing its relations with the Church of the United States, he felt it to be his duty to signify to the Presiding Bishop his canonical consent to this election. In March, 1862, still before any action by this Diocese, he was asked to take part in the consecration of his friend, the Rev. Richard H. Wilmer, as Bishop of Alabama. Dr. Wilmer could not be consecrated in accordance with

the Constitution and Canons of the Church in the United States; and the proposed Constitution of the Church in the Confederate States had not yet been ratified. Bishop Atkinson thought that the constitutionality and regularity of the transmission of the Episcopal Commission were of too much importance to be set aside merely to avoid a few months' delay. He therefore felt obliged to decline to take part in the consecration of a Bishop, which he regarded as unauthorized.

These two cases, first his concurrence in the election and consecration of a Northern Bishop, and then his refusal to approve or to participate in the consecration of a Southern Bishop, gave occasion for much misconception and misrepresentation of his position and feelings, and were a cause of much pain and annoyance to him. They afford, however, another example of his high loyalty to his convictions, and of the calm confidence with which he followed the conclusions of his judgment.

During the continuance of the war Bishop Atkinson pursued diligently the round of his administrative and pastoral duties, visiting his parishes and missions, comforting the bereaved and afflicted, preaching in the camps to the soldiers, and, after the death of the Rev. Dr. Drane, assuming the rectorship of St. James's Church, Wilmington, in addition to his other duties.

I wish I had space to give the prayers which from time to time he put forth to express the devout hopes and wants of his people under their sore burdens. In

heart and mind he was at one with them in all their trials, sufferings, aspirations, hopes and sorrows. And through all he had his people and his Diocese with him. They appreciated his great qualities, and common sufferings increased their mutual confidence and love. His Diocese and his Convention felt safe in taking their stand upon the ground selected by their leader.

When the end came he had his share of the personal sufferings and outrage with which the invading and now victorious enemy emphasized their triumph. His own simple account is most characteristic. Speaking of the approach of General Sherman's army to Wadesboro, where he then resided with his family, he says: "I thought it right to remain and not to leave my household exposed to outrage, and without any protection. I supposed, too, that my age and office would secure me against outrage. In this it turned out that I was mistaken. I was robbed of property of considerable value, and that it might be accomplished more speedily and completely, a pistol was held at my head. While I do not affect to be indifferent, either to the outrage or to the loss I have sustained, I felt at the time, and still feel, that it is a weighty counterbalancing consideration that, partaking of the evils which the people of my charge have been called upon to undergo, I could the more truly and deeply sympathize with them in their sufferings." I have been told, I can not be sure whether by the Bishop himself or by some other, that when the soldier held his cocked pistol at the Bishop's head, and commanded him to give him

his watch, the Bishop calmly but firmly refused to do so. The ruffian then reached down from his horse and seized the watch, and took it from him. He offered no resistance — to have done so would have been both useless and unseemly — but he would not for fear give up his property by his own act. He could be robbed, but he could not be intimidated.

I must endeavor very briefly to summarize the events of September and October, 1865; when, as all must now confess, Bishop Atkinson was the instrument in God's good providence, for reuniting the divided Church, and so healing the breach that not even a scar remains to show there was ever a wound. This was peculiarly the work of Bishop Atkinson and of his Diocese under his guidance. His friend, and nephew by marriage, Bishop Lay, was in all things like-minded with him in this critical period; and together they represented the Southern Church at the General Convention of 1865 in Philadelphia. But Bishop Lay had no Diocese behind him, and his own case, with that of Bishop Wilmer, of Alabama, constituted one of the problems to be solved in order to effect a reunion. He had before the war been Missionary Bishop of the Southwest. During the war, by the Church in the Confederate States, he had been made Bishop of the new Diocese of Arkansas. He did not therefore occupy an assured position for mediating between the two parties.

And now that soundness of judgment and clear view into the true principles of Church polity, which Bishop Atkinson had showed in 1861, became manifest. Of

all the Southern Bishops he was the least embarrassed or trammelled by the results of the war. Those who had maintained, in theory or in practice, that political separation, *ipso facto*, produced, nay, *effected*, ecclesiastical division, had to face the correlative of that proposition — namely, that the restoration of civil union necessitated, if it did not *ipso facto* restore, ecclesiastical unity. He, on the contrary, had maintained, and had acted upon the principle, that political union or disunion did not of itself at all affect the Constitution or organization of the Church. Therefore, when the war ended, and the union of the States was assured, his position was no ways affected. His hands were free and his mind also was free. He had no need to struggle to reconstruct his principles, or to cast about how he might save the remnants from the wreck. Party heat had not affected his judgment in 1861, and he came to the consideration of the situation in 1865 with the same calm mind and clear vision. He said to his people, in effect: The war is over. Bitter as is the confession — we have failed, and all the States are again united under the authority of the Federal Government. We acted for the best. We have no regrets, and we make no apologies. We formed the Church in the Confederate States, because we found it necessary to do so. We did not wait to ask permission from the Dioceses in the North. The emergency was, and is, the explanation and the justification of our course. Facing the present situation, and feeling, as we did in 1861, that we have the right to act freely,

and are not controlled or constrained by the course of political events, we find that the interests of the Church, and consistency with our own principles and professions, require us to go back to the Church in the United States. We believe our sister Dioceses will follow us, but we must act upon our own convictions. We can not wait because others are so situated that they can not act with us at this moment. We can act at once, and we believe it is for the interests of all that we should act at once. And so North Carolina showed then, as perhaps she has at other times shown, that she can be prompt when the occasion calls for it, though sometimes she is slow.

This action of the Convention of the Diocese of North Carolina was the critical and decisive act by which the happy course of our Church history after the war was determined. Bishop Atkinson could not have acted the part he did act, nor would his action have had the effect which it did have, but for the fact that he had his diocese with him in mind and heart, and also visibly represented in the House of Deputies, with its full quota of able and distinguished men whose names stood for something in Church and State. Great as he was in himself, it showed that he did not represent only himself, but that back of him there was in the Southern Church a great body of clergymen and laymen, loyal to the Church, and ready to face bravely present duty, in spite of the past, if they should meet the same loyalty and magnanimity in the Churchmen of the North.

And who shall doubt that the presence of Bishop Atkinson and Bishop Lay and those other Southern Churchmen, for Tennessee and Texas sent also partial delegations, called out that generous spirit with which the General Convention met them!

But it was not an easy thing which those men did who went to Philadelphia from this Diocese in October, 1865. They went with anxious hearts, and against the judgment of some of our best men. I well remember how my uncle, the late Governor Clark, of Edgecombe, one of the gentlest and most generous of men, went with my father to the railway station the morning he was leaving for Philadelphia, and begged him not to go. "At least wait," he said, "until the other Southern Dioceses can act with us." And in Petersburg, where my father stopped, in passing, with an old parishioner, the rector of St. Paul's Church called on him, and was politely humorous and sarcastic in suggesting the kind of reception he might find awaiting him. The way of the peacemaker is not always peaceful or pleasant. Our carnal mind loves a fight, and hates to give it up.

I have no time to repeat the story of the Convention of 1865, of how nobly and beautifully our brethren of the North responded to the confidence shown in them by those who had come from the South to this meeting. It has often been told, and by none better or more authoritatively than by Bishop Lay, in his admirable memorial sermon preached before our Convention of 1881 in Christ Church, Raleigh.

There again came forth Bishop Atkinson's wonderful clarity of thought and accuracy and felicity of expression. "A word spoken in season, how good it is!" That Convention, coming at the end of a great war, had to thank God for the restoration of peace. It was a necessity of the situation. And they were Northern men; and most of them believed in their hearts that slavery had been a national disgrace and curse, and that secession was a crime against the life of the nation. Whatever we may think, let us be fairminded and generous enough to see just how they looked at it. They were thankful for the destruction of all that system of labor and of politics which had gone down in the issues of the contest. And now when they come to have their thanksgiving they must find some terms in which without offense they may ask their Southern brethren to join. And after much labor and travail, and a generous effort to suppress their own feelings, in deference to their Southern brethren, they had managed to reduce all their joy and triumph to a simple expression of thanksgiving for the restoration of peace and unity under the restored national authority. Could more than this have been expected from ordinary mortals?

And then the great and good Southern Bishop, whom many of them loved and admired, and whom one of their own Dioceses had twice elected as its Bishop — he stood up and said, in his noble and gracious but uncompromising manner: We can not join you in such a thanksgiving, but we can join you in thanking God

for the *restoration of peace to the country and unity to the Church.*

And they accepted his offer; and they gave thanks as he prescribed. My admiration for the courage and wisdom and grace of our great Bishop is almost surpassed by my gratitude to God our Father for the magnanimity and Christian brotherliness which so nobly responded to his appeal. And was ever a more eloquent word spoken by a Bishop of the American Church?

The story of that life, and of all that it meant for North Carolina and for the Church at large, cannot be even summarized here. It was the life of a great, noble, godly, and humble spirit, doing its work faithfully and well in high places and low. Its characteristic — assuming recognition of its great intellectual and spiritual gifts — was *poise*, balance, sanity, a serene and intrepid yet humble confidence, not in himself, but in the Truth upon which he stood: "As the Lord God liveth before whom I stand," was his thought and his trust. No civil strife or confusion, no ecclesiastical controversies, no religious prejudices, seemed able to obscure his vision of present truth and duty, or to shake him in his steady and undeviating course.

Though constitutionally conservative, and free from all desire for novelty, and to a great extent unappreciative of the attractiveness of much which the ritualistic movement has added to the services of the Church, he yet refused to put his name to

that once famous "*Declaration*" against ritualism, signed by so many of our best Bishops, but now long forgotten.

It is difficult to point out any error of judgment, and absolutely impossible, I believe, to find any fault of temper, in all his long life, which knew so many trials and difficulties and vicissitudes in Church and in State. It is easy to show how time and again his word was the sure word of truth and wisdom, and his act the act always helpful, and sometimes decisive, in reaching the final result of peace and safety and love.

As I think of him unmoved in his serene clearness of thought and purity of purpose amid all civil discords and party strife, and then equally calm, dignified, unfearing, while the ruffian soldier threatens his life, I am reminded of the words of the Latin poet:

> Just, in high purpose fixed, this man nor breath
> Malign of threatening people, nor the face
> Of lawless force, from his firm mind may shake.[1]

And then, when I think of the divine faith and love which lay underneath all this firmness, and gave beauty to that life, and was in him an unfailing spring of inward peace and hope and refreshing, those familiar

[1] Justum et tenacem propositi virum
Non civium ardor prava jubentium,
Non vultus instantis tyranni,
Mente quatit solida.
— HORACE, Odes, III. 3.

English lines seem to suggest themselves, as perfectly fulfilled and justified in his life and character:

> Like some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
> Swells from the vale and midway leaves the storm,
> Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
> Eternal sunshine settles on his head.

Much more might be said in just and proper appreciation of this noble character and saintly life. The pen which traces these lines needs to be restrained when it enters upon its effort — alas, how inadequate! — to portray him as he was. Perhaps the words on the corner-stone of the Church of the Holy Comforter, the "Atkinson Memorial," in Charlotte, best represent him in the character which meant most to the Church at large, and in which he will be best remembered beyond the bounds of his own Diocese:

Beati Pacifici, quoniam filii Dei vocabuntur.

SPECIAL PRAYERS SET FORTH FOR USE BY BISHOP ATKINSON

In the winter of 1860–1.

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, in Whose hands are the hearts of men and the issues of events, and Who hast graciously promised to hear the prayers of those who, in an humble spirit, and with true faith, call upon Thee; be pleased, we beseech Thee, favorably to look upon and bless the Governor of this Commonwealth, its General Assembly now in session, and the people over whom they are chosen to rule. Possess their minds with the spirit of wisdom and sound understanding, so that, in these days of trouble and perplexity, they may be able to perceive the right path, and steadfastly to walk therein. So enlighten, direct and strengthen them, we pray Thee, that they, being hindered neither by the fear of man, nor by the love of the praise of men, nor by malice, nor by ambition, nor by any other evil passion, but being mindful of Thy constant superintendence, of the awful Majesty of Thy righteousness and of the strict account they must hereafter give to Thee, may, in counsel, word and deed, aim supremely at the fulfilment of their duty, at the promotion of Thy glory, and the advancement of the welfare of our country. And grant that the

course of this world may be so peaceably ordered by Thy governance, that Thy Church, and this whole people, may joyfully serve Thee in all godly quietness, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

A prayer for those who have gone forth to war in defence of their State and Country.

O Most Gracious Lord God, our Heavenly Father, we commend to Thy care and protection Thy servants, who in behalf of their families and their country have gone forth to meet the dangers of war. Direct and lead them in safety; bless them in their efforts to protect and defend this land; preserve them from the violence of the sword and from sickness; from injurious accidents; from treachery and from surprise; from carelessness of duty, from confusion and fear; from mutiny and disorder, from evil living, and from forgetfulness of Thee. Enable them to return in safety and honor; that we being defended from those who would do us hurt, may rejoice in thy mercies, and Thy Church give Thee thanks in Peace and Truth, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

A Prayer for the People of the Confederate States.

O Lord, our God, Who rulest over all the Hosts of Heaven, and over all the nations of the earth, Thou hast power to cast down, or to raise up whomsoever Thou wilt, and to save by many or by few; and we now come to Thee to help and defend us in this time

of danger and necessity. We acknowledge and lament, O God, the many grievous sins, by which we have justly provoked Thy wrath and indignation, and wert Thou extreme to mark iniquities, O Lord, we could not abide it. But it is Thy nature and property ever to have mercy and to forgive; and we beseech Thee now to extend to us Thine accustomed mercy, and to deliver us from the evils and dangers to which we are exposed. Do Thou, O Lord, remove from our borders all invading armies; confound the devices of such as would do us hurt, and send us speedily a just and honorable and lasting peace. And above every earthly blessing give us, as a people, grace to know, and love, and serve Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

INDEX

INDEX

A

Abolition Societies and Petitions, 111.
Addison, Rev. Thomas G., 181.
Alabama, Diocese of, 20, 43, 49, 54, 55, 80, 138, 142, 150, 183 *et seq.*, 249, 252.
Alexandria, Va., clergy of, 172 *et seq.*
Andrews, Rev. Dr. Charles W., 108.
Arkansas, Diocese of, 54, 55, 204, 243.
Army, Confederate, 69 *et seq.*
—— of Northern Va., 69 *et seq.*, 89.
—— of Tennessee, 47, 80, 84.
Arthur, Rev. Thos. S., 80.
Atkinson, Rt. Rev. Thomas, Bishop of North Carolina, 7, 28 *et seq.*, 50 *et seq.*, 131 *et seq.*, 214 *et seq.*, 239 *et seq.*, 257 *et seq. et passim.*
Augusta, Ga., "General Councils" at, in 1862, 55 *et seq.*; of 1865, 249 *et seq.*

B

Baptisms, by Bishop Polk, 47.
Baptist Association of Georgia, on Marriage of Slaves, 118.
Barnard, Rev. Frederick A. P., 35.
Barnwell, Rev. Robert W., 80.
Battle, Hon. William H., 139, 210, note, 223, 225.
—— Kemp P., 225, 241 note.
Beckwith, Rt. Rev. John W. [later Bishop of Georgia], 79.
Bedell, Rt. Rev. Gregory T., Bishop of Ohio, 6 note, 181.
Bishops, House of, Question of opening its sessions, 136.
Blackstone, Sir William, 112 note.
Blount, Surgeon William A., 161 and note.
Boone, Rt. Rev. William J., Bishop of China, 32, 59.
Bragg, General Braxton, 84, 85.
Brand, Rev. William F., 243 note.
Brown, Colonel H. Allen, 87.
Burgess, Rt. Rev. George, Bishop of Maine, 244 *et seq.*
Butler, General Benj. F., 174, 175.

C

Canons of the Church in the Confederate States, 42, 45.
Carmichael, Rev. James, 164.
Chaplains in the Confederate Army, 78 *et seq.*

Chaplains, List of, 103 *et seq.*
Cheshire, Rev. Joseph Blount, 102, 223, 224, 274.
Christ in the Camp, 77, 79 note.
Church Intelligencer, The, 94 *et seq. et passim.*
Clark, Hon. Henry T., 274.
Clayton, Colonel Powell, 172.
Clergy of the South, their necessities, 146 *et seq.*
——, their special difficulties, 169 *et seq.*
Cobbs, Rt. Rev. Nicholas H., Bishop of Alabama, 5, 7, 261.
Collins, Josiah, 128.
Columbia, S. C., Meeting at, 39 *et seq.*, 49.
"Confederate Prayer Book," 98 *et seq.*
Constitution of the Confederate States, 159.
—— of the Church in the Confederate States, 36, 39 *et seq.*, 51, 54, 64.

D

Daves, Major Graham, 89 note.
Davis, Hon. Jefferson, President of the Confederate States, 159.
——, Rt. Rev. Thomas F., Bishop of South Carolina, 7, 12, 21 *et seq.*, 123, 137, 231 *et seq. et passim.*
——, Rev. Thomas F., Jr., 142.
Deaconesses, Order of, 150.
De Fontaine, F. G., 165 note.
De Rosset, Dr. Armand J., 102.
——, Colonel William L., 85 note.
Drayton, General Thomas F., 263.
DuBose, Rev. McNeely, 101.

E

Elliott, Rt. Rev. Stephen, Bishop of Georgia, 5, 7, 18, 20, 35, 55, 63, 136, 211 *et seq. et passim.*
England, Church of, Influence in abolishing slavery, 112.
Episcopal Recorder, 210 note.
Everhart, Rev. George M., 93, 97.
Ewell, General Richard E., 71 note.
Eyre & Spottiswoode, 100, 102.

F

Fast Days, 10, 153, 159.
"Faunsdale Plantation," 127.
Fitzgerald, Rev. Frederick, 73, 95.
Florida, Diocese of, 21, 54, 56, 217, 252.
Fulton, Rev. John, 3, 49 note, 63, 174, 186, 190.

G

Gadsden, Rev. Christopher P., 12.
Gaston, Hon. William, 110.
General Convention, of 1859, 5, 95, 121; of 1862, 205, 209; of 1865, 189, 203, 209 and note, 239 *et seq.*
Georgia, Diocese of, 21, 54, 80, 145, 210 *et seq.*, 249, 252.

Gibson, Rev. Churchill J., 53.
Glenn, Captain Chalmers, 131.
Glennie, Rev. Alexander, 123 *et seq.*
Goodrich, Rev. Charles, 174.
Goolsby, John, 130.
Graham, Hon. William A., 210 note.
Gray, Rev. William C. [later Bishop of Southern Florida], 79.
Green, Rev. Henry F., 95.
——, Rt. Rev. Wm. M., Bishop of Mississippi, 5, 7, 55, 125 *et seq.*, 136, 142, 146, 154, 167, 171, 216.
Gregg, Rt. Rev. Alexander, Bishop of Texas, 3, 6 note, 7, 11, 12, 17, 125, 144, 150 note, 182, 214 note.

H

Hairston, Major Peter W., 130.
Hale, Edward J., 224.
Hanckle, Rev. Christopher, 56.
Hardee, General William J., 47, 85, 92.
Harris, Rev. G. C., 172
Harrison, Mrs. ——, 127.
——, Rev. William H. 56, 249.
Hines, Rev. Richard, 41.
Hodges, Rev. William, 223, 224.
Hoge, Rev. Moses D., 149.
Hood, General John B., 47, 81, 82, 85, 92.
Hopkins, Rt. Rev. John Henry, Bishop of Vermont, 203, 206, 208, 211, 239, 245.
——, Rev. John Henry, Jr., 239.
Hospitals, 160 *et seq.*, 164.
—— "Call to the," a poem, 165.
—— Female, Aid Society, 162.
Hubbard, Rev. Fordyce M., 97, 224, 242.
Hunt, Hon. Washington, 247.
Huske, Rev. Joseph C., 102.
Hymnody, 142 *et seq.*

I

Indiana, Diocese of, 261.
Intrusions, 180 *et seq.*
Ives, Rt. Rev. L. Silliman, Bishop of North Carolina, 234, 264.

J

Jackson, "Stonewall," 71 note, 72, 75, 77, 78, 88 *et seq.*
Jefferson, Thomas, denounces slavery, 108.
Johns, Rt. Rev. John, Bishop of Virginia, 7, 28, 52, 53, 78, 99, 181, 198 *et seq.*, 207, 226 *et seq.*
Johnson, Andrew, President of the United States, 189.
Johnston, General Joseph E., 47, 82, 85, 92.
Jones, Rev. J. William, 77, 79 note.
Jones, Rev. Lucius H., 90 and note.

L

Lay, Rt. Rev. Henry C., Bishop of Arkansas, 5, 6 note, 7, 25 *et seq.*, 80 *et seq.*, 137, 142, 150 note, 163, 175 *et seq.*, 177 note,

215, 245 *et seq.*, 253, *et seq. et passim.*
Lee, General Robert E., 53, 75 *et seq.*, 78, 89, 110, 181, 202.
Louisiana, Diocese of, 20, 35, 39, 46.
—— not in Church in Confederate States, 54, 56, 217.

M

Macfarlane & Furgusson, 99.
Magruder, General John B., 86.
Marriage among slaves, 117 *et seq.*, 119 note, 124.
Mason, Rev. Richard S., 102, 139, 223, 224.
"Matt" a slave, 131.
Maynard, R. J. & Co., 98.
McConnell, Rev. Samuel D., 191 note.
McCook, General [Alexander McD.], 172.
McCrady, Edward, 139.
McIlvaine, Rt. Rev. Charles P., Bishop of Ohio, 181.
McKim, Rev. Randolph H., 74.
Meade, Rt. Rev. William, Bishop of Virginia, 7, 28, 39, 44, 52 *et seq.*, 73, 109, 110, 197.
—— his position as to slavery, 110.
Meredith, Rev. William C., 86.
Military Orders closing churches in Alabama, 186 *et seq.*, 244.
Miller, Rev. Benjamin M., 162 *et seq.*
Missions, Foreign and Domestic, 36, 43, 58, 59 *et seq.*
Mississippi, Diocese of, 35, 54, 55, 80, 125, 210, 249, 252.
Mitchell, General Ormsby McK., 175 *et seq.*
—— Rev. John M., 35, 56, 249.
Montgomery, Ala., 17 note, 19, 28, 35 *et seq.*, 39.
Moral Conditions in the South as affected by the war, 159.
Mott, Rev. Thomas S. W., 95, 97.

N

Name of the Church, Proposed Change of, 41 and note, 136.
Negroes, Church Work for, 43, 59, 61, 120 *et seq.*
——, many manumitted in Virginia, 108.
New Orleans, clergy of, 173.
New York, Diocesan Convention of, 236 *et seq.*
—— *Daily News*, 187 note.
Niles, Rt. Rev. William W., Bishop of New Hampshire, 98 note.
Noll, Rev. Arthur H., 84.
North Carolina, Diocese of, 28, 54, 79, 80, 217, 223 *et seq.*, 235, 264 *et seq.*, 268, 272.

O

Oath of Allegiance, 179, 184.
Odenheimer, Rt. Rev. William H., Bishop of New Jersey, 6 note, 246.
Osborne, Rev. Edwin A., 70 and note.

Otey, Rt. Rev. James Harvey, Bishop of Tennessee, 5, 7, 9, 10, 41, 50, 136; his death, 217 note.

P

Packard, Rev. Joseph, 76.
——, Joseph [Jr.], 77 and note.
Page, Mrs. Anne R., 108.
Papers, Church, 94, 96, 210 note, *et passim.*
Parker, Rev. John Haywood, 111 and note.
Pastoral Letters, 10, 13, 14, 16, 60 *et seq.*, 144, 154, 162, 184, 187, 207, 231 *et seq.*
Patterson, Rev. George, 87 *et seq.*, 129 and note.
Payner, Rev. John, Missionary Bishop at Cape Palmas, 32, 59.
Peake, Rev. [E. Steele?], 180.
Pendleton, Rev. Wm. N., 77, 151.
Perkins, Rev. Edward T., 86.
Perry, Rt. Rev. William Stevens, Bishop of Iowa, his History of the American Episcopal Church, 3, 49 note, 63.
Phelan, Hon. John D., 139.
Philadelphia, 241. General Convention at, 1865, 239 *et seq.*, 251.
Pinckney, Rev. Charles C., 249.
Pittman, Dr. N. J., 161 and note.
Polk, Rt. Rev. Leonidas, Bishop of Louisiana, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14 *et seq.*, 17 *et seq.*, 46 *et seq.*, 92, *et passim;* his death, 47, 92.
Porter, Rev. A. Toomer, 80.
Potter, Rt. Rev. Horatio, Bishop of New York, 236, 240, 243.
Praemunire,[1] statutes of, 22.
Prayers, for Civil Rulers, 12 *et* seq., 140 note, 169 *et seq.*, 184 *et seq.*, 192 *et seq.*
—— special, 10 *et seq.*, 164, 279 *et seq.*
Prayer Book, 27, 56 *et seq.*, 65, 98, 138 *et seq.*, 250.
——, the "Proposed Book," of 1785, 193.
——, the "Army and Navy," 91, 99.
——, "The Confederate," 99 *et seq.*
Presbyterian Southern on marriage of slaves, 118.
"Protestant Episcopal Church Female Bible, Prayer Book and Tract Society," 91.
"—— Publishing Association," 93, 97.
Provincial System, 40, 137.
Psalmody, 142.

Q

Quintard, Rt. Rev. Chas. T., Bishop of Tennessee, 47, 79, 82, 83 *et seq.*, 92, 105, 237, 254, 256.

[1] It being too late to alter the text at page 22, the writer would state here that the statutes of *Praemunire* are referred to, as they are popularly understood, following Blackstone's interpretation. Modern historians interpret them somewhat differently.

J. B. C.

R

Randolph, Rt. Rev. Alfred M. [later Bishop of Southern Virginia], 79, 86, 164.
——, J. W., 100, 101.
Ravenscroft, Rt. Rev. John Stark, Bishop of North Carolina, 234, 264.
Richmond, General Convention of 1859, 5, 95.
—— *Sentinel*, 148.
—— *Whig*, 131.
"*Robert E. Lee, The*," Blockade Runner, 101.
Ruffin, Hon. Thomas, 210 note.
Rutledge, Rt. Rev. Francis H., Bishop of Florida, 5, 7, 12, 14, 35.

S

Sass, Jacob K., 36, 43, 60, 92.
Savannah, Roman Catholic Bishop of, on the marriage of slaves, 119.
Scarcity and want in the South, 147 *et seq.*, 160.
Schism, Southern Church not liable to the charge of, 204 *et seq.*, 218 *et seq.*
Secession, dates of, in the several States, 37.
——, effect upon status of the Southern Dioceses, 14 *et seq.* 19 *et seq.*, 29 *et seq.*, 266 *et seq.*
Seymour, Hon. Thomas H., of Connecticut, 209 note.
Shepley, General George F., 174.
Sherman, General William T., 177 note.
Shipp, Hon. William M., 223.
Sick and wounded, care of, 160 *et seq.*
Slavery in the South, 106 *et seq.*
——, effect of Christianity upon, 111 *et seq.*
Smedes, Rev. Aldert, 95 note.
Smith, Rev. James Power, 71 note.
——, Richard H., 223, 225.
——, Sir Thomas, 112 note.
South Carolina, Diocese of, 19, 35, 80, 140 note, 249, 252, 263 *et seq.*
——, work among the slaves, 121 *et seq.*
Southern Churchman, the, 96.
—— *Episcopalian*, the, 96.
Sparrow, Rev. William, 139.
Stevens, Rt. Rev. Wm. Bacon, Bishop of Pennsylvania, 35, 49, 51, 247, 268.
Stewart, Rev. Kensey J., 172 *et seq.*
Stickney, Mrs. ——, 127.
Strange, Rt. Rev. Robert, Bishop of East Carolina, 86 note.
——, Colonel Robert, 225.
Stuart, General J. E. B., 75.
Sutton, Rev. Robert B., 102.
Swain, Hon. David L., 210 note.

T

Tennessee, Diocese of, 39, 55, 80, 241, 274.
——, not in "Church in the Confederate States," 54 *et seq.*, 217.

Texas, Diocese of, 20, 54, 80, 183, 214, 216, 231 note, 236, 241, 274.
Thomas, General George H., 186, 201.
Trapier, Rev. Paul, 124, 139.
Trescott, Henry, 36, 43, 59.
Trimble, Rev. Robert W., 172.

U

"Union Men" in the South in 1860, 8.

V

Vail, Rt. Rev. Thomas H., Bishop of Kansas, 55.
Vance, Hon. Zebulon B., 210 note.
Villeins, Regardant and *in Gross*, 112 and note.
Virginia, Diocese of, 28, 54, 55, 77, 79, 80, 152, 197, 226 *et seq.*, 249, 252.
——, Diocesan Missionary Society, 91, 99.
——, movement to abolish slavery, 109.

W

Waccamaw, S. C., All Saints' Parish, work among the slaves, 122, 123 *et seq.*
Washington, George, 107, 193.
Watson, Rev. Alfred A. [later Bishop of East Carolina], 79, 85 *et seq.*, 170, 222 *et seq.*
Weller, Rev. M. Leander, 90.
Welsh, John and William, 242.
Wesleys, the, and George Whitefield, 5.
Wetmore, Rev. William R., 170.
Whipple, Rt. Rev. Henry B., Bishop of Minnesota, 6 note.
Wilkes, John, 93, 97, 102.
Wilmer, Rt. Rev. Richard H., Bishop of Alabama, 43, 45, 49 *et seq.*, 94, 141, 150, 178, 208 *et passim*.
——, his consecration, 49 *et seq. et passim*
——, his troubles in 1865, 183 *et seq.*
Wingfield, Rt. Rev. John H. D. [later Bishop of Northern California], 174 *et seq.*
Woods, General William B., 186, 187.
Wynne, Charles H., 99.

Y

Yerger, Colonel George S., 126.

This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date

The borrower must return this item on or before the last date stamped below. If another user places a recall for this item, the borrower will be notified of the need for an earlier return.

Non-receipt of overdue notices does ***not*** *exempt the borrower from overdue fines.*

Harvard College Widener Library
Cambridge, MA 02138 617-495-2413



Please handle with care.
Thank you for helping to preserve library collections at Harvard.